Benefaction and Rewards in the Ancient Greek City

The Origins of Euergetism

Marc Domingo Gygax



BENEFACTION AND REWARDS IN THE ANCIENT GREEK CITY

This volume presents for the first time an in-depth analysis of the origins of Greek euergetism. Derived from the Greek for "benefactor," "euergetism" refers to the process whereby citizens and foreigners offered voluntary services and donations to the polis, which were in turn recognized as benefactions in a formal act of reciprocation. Euergetism is key to our understanding of how city-states negotiated both the internal tensions between mass and elite and their conflicts with external powers. This study adopts the standpoint of historical anthropology and seeks to identify patterns of behavior and social practices deeply rooted in Greek society and in the long course of Greek history. It covers more than 500 years and will appeal to historians and scholars in other fields interested in gift-exchange, benefactions, philanthropy, power relationships between mass and elite, and the interplay between public discourse and social praxis.

MARC DOMINGO GYGAX is Associate Professor of Classics at Princeton University and author of *Untersuchungen zu den lykischen Gemeinwesen in klassischer und hellenistischer Zeit* (2001). His main interests lie in ancient Greek history, historical anthropology, historical theory, and modern historiography.

BENEFACTION AND REWARDS IN THE ANCIENT GREEK CITY

The Origins of Euergetism

MARC DOMINGO GYGAX

Princeton University

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521515351

© Marc Domingo Gygax 2016

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2016

Printed in the United Kingdom by Clays, St Ives plc

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data
Domingo Gygax, Marc, author.
Benefaction and rewards in the ancient Greek city : the origins of euergetism / Marc Domingo Gygax (Princeton University).
Cambridge, United Kingdom ; New York, New York : Cambridge University Press, 2016. | Includes bibliographical references and index.
LCCN 2016006999 | ISBN 9780521515351 (hardback : alkaline paper)
LCSH: Greece – History – To 146 B.C. | Benefactors – Greece – History – To 1500. | Voluntarism – Greece – History – To 1500. | Gifts – Greece – History – To 1500. | City and town life – Greece – History – To 1500. | City-states – Greece – History – To 1500. | Interpersonal relations – Greece – History – To 1500. | Power (Social sciences) – Greece – History – To 1500. | Greece – Social life and customs. | Greece – Social conditions – To 146 B.C. | BISAC: HISTORY / Ancient / General.
LCC DF78 .D645 2016 | DDC 302.3–dc23
LC record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2016006999

ISBN 978-0-521-51535-1 Hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

To the Memory of Jipé, Josep Maria, and Charles

Contents

Preface *page* xi
Acknowledgments xiv
List of abbreviations xv

Introduction 1
1 Words and things 1
2 Why euergetism? 5
3 Precedents and debts 9
4 Generosity and interest 12
5 Greek history and gift-giving 14

1 Synchronic approaches 19
1 The paradox of public subscriptions 19
2 Structures and principles 26
2.1 Gifts and counter-gifts 26
Disjunction 32
Equivalence 33
Imbalance 35
2.2 Euergetism and gift-exchange 36
Further comparisons 40
The vocabulary of gift-exchange 43
3 Proleptic honors 45
3.1 Playing with the rules of euergetism 46
3.2 The scope of proleptic honors 48
3.3 The logic of proleptic honors 53

2 Creating an institution 58
1 The initial stages of euergetism 58
1.1 The first euergetai and euergetic honors 58
1.2 Athletes as benefactors 63
Honors for athletes 66
Epinikia as rewards 69
2 Non-institutionalized reciprocity 72
2.1 Elite contributions 73

2.2 Archaic liturgies 79
2.3 Benefactions and reciprocity 84
The notion of benefaction 84
Institutional and non-institutional rewards 86
3 The tyrant's generosity 91
3.1 Elite benefactions 91
3.2 Tyrannical dimensions 96
3.3 The "big man" metaphor 103

3 Continuity and change (1): foreigners and athletes 107
1 Polis and foreigners 108
1.1 *Proxenia* and *euergesia* 109
1.2 *Proxenia* and the origins of euergetism 112
2 Polis and athletes 114
2.1 Statues as rewards 114
2.2 Other possible (and impossible) rewards 120
3 Athenian exceptionalism? 124
3.1 The absence and presence of athlete statues 124
3.2 Between honorific statue and private dedication 129
3.3 Safe and unsafe honors 131
Sitêsis and *proedria* 131
The dangers of statues 133

4 Continuity and change (2): citizens 139
1 Patterns of civic benefaction in fifth-century Athens 139
1.1 The archaic tradition 139
1.2 Gifts and (in)dependence 144
Attitudes 144
Alternatives to gifts 149
1.3 The new benefactors 151
Services 151
Political rewards 154
1.4 The demos as benefactor 156
2 Toward public honors 161
2.1 Harmodius and Aristogiton 161
2.2 The problem of self-representation 165
Statues 165
The paintings in the Stoa Poikile 168
2.3 Between prize and reward 170
Awards of valor 171
Prizes for liturgists 172
2.4 Early honors 175

5 The generalization of euergetism 180
1 Euergetism and war 181
1.1 Benefactors during the Peloponnesian War 181

1.2 Beyond military benefactions 185
2 Benefactors without empire 192
2.1 The great *euergetai* of fourth-century Athens 192
2.2 Responding to financial challenges 199
Liturgies, *eisphorai*, and *epidoseis* 200
Gifts in office and private donations 207
2.3 New (and old) perceptions 215
3 The euergetic system 218
3.1 Continuity and innovation 218
3.2 Embedded features 223
3.3 Euergetic honors 224
3.4 *Deipnon* (and *xenia*) in the prytaneion 234
3.5 Deserved and undeserved honors 240
4 Epilogue: sequence and causal relationships 243

Conclusions 251

Bibliography 259
The index of literary sources 292
The index of inscriptions 302
General Index 308

Preface

The origins of this book on Greek benefactors, rewards, and the institution of euergetism go back to my earlier work on the development and evolution of the polis in classical and Hellenistic Lycia. Although the two projects may seem to have little in common, my research on Lycia largely relied on inscribed honorific decrees for benefactors. I soon became interested in such decrees not only as sources of local history but also as manifestations of a universal institution in the Greek world. Euergetism is key to our understanding of how the Greek polis negotiated both internal relations between the demos and the elite and its relations with external agents. My first step was to write a paper on euergetism in Lycia, followed by a comparative essay on the two main scholars of euergetism, Paul Veyne and Philippe Gauthier. I originally envisioned a book on euergetism in the Hellenistic and Roman imperial periods, but when I began work on it, I realized that a study of the institution's origins was needed.

The true beginning of this book is my 2003 article on euergetism and gift-exchange, which marks the line followed in my subsequent research. Since then, I have published a number of other articles on the subject, which were reworked for this volume and are listed in the Bibliography. Half of these articles were not written in English but in German, French, or Spanish, which has limited their diffusion but has allowed me to think about euergetism through different lenses. The latter consequence is also a result of carrying out my work in places with different languages and scholarly traditions: Barcelona (closely linked to Paris), Tübingen, Berlin, Berkeley, Washington D.C., and especially Princeton. I tried to learn from each tradition, making the result a somewhat heterogeneous product that corresponds to no particular "school."

This is a historical study that adopts the standpoint of historical anthropology. I do not mean by this that the book is partially based on the work of social and cultural anthropologists dealing with gift-exchange. Instead,

I refer to the approach to history from which it is written. Specifically, I seek to identify – beyond individual cases and exceptions – patterns of behavior and social practices deeply rooted in Greek society and the long course of Greek history. I look for regularities, continuities, and rules underlying a wide range of human actions. My goal is not to isolate ahistorical features but to analyze the role these more or less stable elements played in the historical process and how their articulation with more dynamic constituents triggered social change. Simplification is inevitable in such an approach, but my belief is that in historical inquiry, a certain degree of generalization is both possible and desirable. On the other hand, the basis of the book is strongly empirical. At this level, I have tried to avoid simplification; the reader will find substantial footnotes with many references to literary and epigraphic sources and detailed discussion of documents. Since the evidence for the early stages of euergetism has not previously been collected, I hope that this will be helpful even for readers who disagree with my interpretations.

The first chapter begins with a case study that attempts to pose the major questions discussed in the book as a whole, offering an explanation of the main principles and structure of euergetism as we find them in the Hellenistic period. This means that I begin with analysis, without narrative and with a focus on the final stage of the process I seek to explain. The chapters that follow, by contrast, are arranged in chronological order and take the reader from the origins of euergetism in the archaic age to fourth-century Athens and the transition to Hellenistic euergetism. The result is an essay covering more than 500 years and based on highly diverse evidence: inscriptions, oratory, historical writing, poetry, plays, philosophy. My purpose, however, is not to provide an overview of a significant period of Greek history but to analyze the *longue durée* of a particular aspect of it, the understanding of which requires detailed knowledge of historical context. To attempt this for such a long period has been one of the main challenges of the project. I apologize in advance to specialists in any of these periods, types of documents, and literary genres for the shortcomings they may discover here.

I have written for an audience of ancient historians and classicists, but I hope this book will also appeal to scholars in other fields in the humanities and social sciences interested in gift-exchange, benefactions, and related phenomena (philanthropy, altruism, charity), power relationships between mass and elite, and the interplay between public discourse and social praxis. With this in mind, I have renounced use of the Greek alphabet and have transliterated Greek words; proper names have been

Latinized. Quotations from Greek texts are given in English translation. Most translations of literary texts are based on the Loeb Classical Library. In the case of inscriptions, I have tried to use translations from easily accessible collections such as Michael Austin's and Stephen Lambert's, where available, to allow non-classicists to check the context of the passages if necessary. Where not otherwise indicated, translations of inscriptions are my own.

Acknowledgments

In the course of writing this book, I incurred many debts on both sides of the Atlantic. The Alexander von Humboldt Foundation, the Center for Hellenic Studies in Washington, Princeton University, and the AGAUR office of the Generalitat of Catalonia provided support in the form of fellowships. I was invited to present some of my ideas and preliminary versions of portions of the manuscript in lectures and papers at the University of Tübingen, Princeton University, the University of Provence Aix-Marseille, the École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, the University of Pennsylvania, the Catalan Institute of Classical Archaeology in Tarragona, Yale University, the University of Münster, the University of Basel, Brown University, the College of New Jersey, and the Institute for Advanced Study. I am very grateful for the hospitality of these institutions and for the many suggestions I received from audiences at them. Special thanks are due to the colleagues and friends who read earlier versions of the manuscript or parts of it: Anna Alsina Naudi, Zach Biles, Kostas Buraselis, Tim Duff, Marco Fantuzzi, Joshua Fincher, Harriet Flower, Elizabeth Key Fowden, Johannes Hahn, Stephen Lambert, Nino Luraghi, S. Douglas Olson, Adrià Piñol Villanueva, David Rosenbloom, Brent Shaw, and Stephen Tracy. My colleagues in the Department of Classics at Princeton University have influenced me more than they may suspect. After having spent most of my career surrounded by historians and archaeologists, the experience of working with "classicists" changed many of my views. I am also grateful to Frank Kolb, Erich Gruen, and Josh Ober. Without their many years of continuous help and encouragement, it would have been impossible to complete this book. One of my greatest debts is to Jean-Pierre Vernant, who was a constant source of inspiration and support from the time I first visited him in Paris in 1986. But not all my inspiration came from scholars. The poetry and art of Joan Brossa, Perejaume, Alfons Borrell, and Chema Madoz taught me ways of looking at things that I believe can be felt throughout this book. I conclude on a personal note, expressing my gratitude to Anna Alsina Naudi, Jan, and Georgina for their love and patience, for which I will never be able to thank them enough.

Abbreviations

Abbreviations of journal titles are those used in *L'Année philologique*. Other abbreviations are as follows.

Agora XV	B. D. Meritt and J. S. Traill, *The Athenian Agora. XV. Inscriptions. The Athenian Councillors.* Princeton. 1974.
Agora XVI	A. G. Woodhead, *The Athenian Agora. XVI. Inscriptions. The Decrees.* Princeton. 1997.
Bull. ép.	"Bulletin épigrapique" in *Revue des études grècques*. Paris. 1888–
CEG	P. A. Hansen, *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca*. Berlin. 1983–9.
FGrH	F. Jacoby, *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*. Berlin and Leiden. 1923–
FGE	D. L. Page, *Further Greek Epigrams*. Cambridge and New York. 1981.
FHG	K. Müller, *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*. Paris. 1841–70.
I. Cret.	M. Guarducci, *Inscriptiones Creticae*, Roma. 1935–50.
I. Ephesos	H. Wankel et al. *Die Inschriften von Ephesos*. Bonn. 1979–84.
I. Erythrai	H. Engelmann and R. Merkelbach, *Die Inschriften von Erythrai und Klazomenai*. Bonn. 1972–3.
I. Kyme	H. Engelmann, *Die Inschriften von Kyme*. Bonn. 1976.
I. Olympia	W. Dittenberger and K. Purgold, *Die Inschriften von Olympia*. Berlin. 1896.
I. Smyrna	G. Petzl, *Die Inschriften von Smyrna*. Bonn. 1982–90.
IG	*Inscriptiones Graecae*
LSJ	*A Greek–English Lexicon*. Oxford. 1996[9].

Meiggs–Lewis	R. Meiggs and D. Lewis, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century*. Oxford. 1988^{2}.
Michel, *Recueil*	C. Michel, *Recueil d'inscriptions grecques*. Brussels. 1900.
Nomima	H. van Effenterre and F. Ruzé, *Nomima. Recueil d'inscriptions politiques et juridiques de l'archaïsme grec.* Paris and Rome. 1994–5.
OCD	*Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Oxford. 2012^{4}.
OGIS	W. Dittenberger, *Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae*. Leipzig. 1903–5.
PMG	D. L. Page, *Poetae Melici Graeci*. Oxford. 1962.
RC	C. B. Welles, *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period: A Study in Greek Epigraphy*. New Haven. 1934.
RO	P. J. Rhodes and R. Osborne, *Greek Historical Inscriptions: 404–323 BC*. Oxford. 2003.
SEG	*Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum.*
SLG	D. L. Page, *Supplementum lyricis graecis*. Oxford. 1974.
Syll.^{3}	W. Dittenberger, *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*. Leipzig. 1915–1924.
TAM	*Tituli Asiae Minoris.*
Tod	M. N. Tod, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions*. Oxford. 1933–48.
TrGF	B. Snell, R. Kannicht, and S. Radt, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. Göttingen. 1971–2004.
W	M. B. Walbank, *Athenian Proxenies of the Fifth Century B.C.* Toronto and Sarasota. 1978.

Introduction

1 Words and things

This is a book about euergetism. But what is euergetism? Above all else, it is a word, a neologism – "évergétisme" – derived from *euergetês* and used for the first time in 1923 by André Boulanger in a study of Aelius Aristides. Henri-Irénée Marrou mentions the term in his *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'Antiquité* (1948), but only much more recently has it become widespread among scholars of the ancient world.[1] Paul Veyne's *Le pain et le cirque* (1976) was largely responsible for this, although scholarly response to his work was slow. In 1969, Veyne published an article in *Annales* entitled "Panem et Circenses: l'évergétisme devant les sciences humaines," and by the time *Le pain et le cirque* appeared, "euergetism" had attracted the attention of French historians.[2] It took time, however, for *Le pain et le cirque* to become a standard reference work. This is, after all, a work of "sociological history" inspired by Max Weber's sociology and far removed from the traditional methodology of ancient historians, and it is revealing that only one review of it appeared in a specialized journal.[3] But the passage of time, together with the movement of the social sciences and the humanities toward a postmodern paradigm more favorable to Veyne's Weberian point of view than to the positivism, Marxism, and structuralism of the 1970s, as well as the translation of the book into Italian (1984),

[1] Boulanger 1923: 25; Marrou 1948: 161, 405. In the 1956 English version of Marrou's book, the translator did not dare to use the word "euergetism" more than once, and at its second appearance in the original (405), he chose to translate it as "private munificence" (305).

[2] One need only note the work by Edmond Lévy, *Athènes devant la défaite de 404*, published in the same year (Lévy 1976, esp. 238–55). Cf. Veyne 1969 and Veyne 1976a.

[3] Veyne 1990: 2: "This is a work of sociological history: provided, that is, we use the word 'sociology' in the same way as Max Weber did" (in the French version Veyne 1976a: 11). The only review in a classics journal was by R. Chevallier in *Latomus*, 37, 1978: 226–31. But reviews appeared in publications of a more general nature, such as *Annales. Économies, Sociétés, Civilisations*, 33, 1978: 307–25 (J. Andreau et al.: ii) and *The Times Literary Supplement*, March 24, 1978, 356 (F. Millar). Veyne's book sparked some interest among sociologists (Elster 1983; Stinchcombe 1986) but received limited attention nonetheless, as it dealt with a subject pertaining to the ancient world.

German (1988), and English (1990), has conspired to make *Le pain et le cirque* an influential work, resulting in the popularization of the term "euergetism." Not all the credit for this belongs to Veyne. Philippe Gauthier also contributed to the popularity of the term with his *Les cités grecques et leurs bienfaiteurs* (1985), a book that engages in an open polemic with Veyne and that – in contrast to the latter's study – had an immediate impact among specialists.[4] As a consequence, in recent years numerous works have been published about various places (from Asia Minor to the Iberian Peninsula) and times (from classical antiquity to the seventh century AD) that include the term "euergetism" in their titles. Today we speak of "Greek euergetism," "Roman euergetism," "Christian euergetism," "religious euergetism," and "female euergetism."[5]

In general, the term "euergetism" is used by these authors to signify the phenomenon of the voluntary financing of public buildings, festivals, and city institutions such as schools, as well as the distribution of food or money by individual citizens, foreigners, Hellenistic kings, Roman emperors, and their representatives – what the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* calls "the socio-political phenomenon of voluntary gift-giving to the ancient community." This notion of euergetism corresponds to Veyne's definition ("gifts to the community and acts of patronage towards the city") and to the concept used by Boulanger, who refers to "the families in which 'euergetism' was a tradition," as well as to Marrou's conception, according to which it consists of "'foundations' by which private individuals gave the city capital to provide income for the upkeep, or at least the improvement of some particular public service."[6] Euergetism is taken to be a phenomenon distinguished by unilateral action, in which benefactors play an active role and the community a passive one. The former are the protagonists, the latter the recipients.

But euergetism can also be understood in another way, which does not contradict the previous interpretation but complements it, by incorporating the reaction of the beneficiaries.[7] With this definition – the one used in this book – euergetism has two faces: the benefactions, but also the honors granted by poleis to their benefactors. Its main characteristic is thus

[4] Gauthier 1985: esp. 7–10.

[5] See the examples collected in Domingo Gygax 2003: 182 n. 3. To this list one can add Yon 2001; Pietri 2002; Vuolanto 2002; Goffin 2002; Lomas and Cornell 2003; Grätz 2004; Bringmann 2005; Thiers 2006; Beck 2007; Denlaux 2008; Curty 2009; Holstein 2010; Plácido and Fornis 2011; Zuiderhoek 2011; Hamon 2012; Brown 2013; Cracco Ruggini 2014.

[6] Spawforth 2012 (*OCD* 4th ed.); Veyne 1990: 1 (in the French edition Veyne 1976a): 9; Boulanger 1923: 25; Marrou 1948: 161 (quotation from Marrou 1956: 112).

[7] See Domingo Gygax 2003; Domingo Gygax 2009; Colpaert 2014: 186–8, 197–8; Blank 2014: 393–9.

reciprocity. From this perspective, euergetism was not a phenomenon but an *institution*: a polis-sanctioned practice of exchanging benefactions and rewards. This conception of euergetism rests on the idea that benefactions imply honors: they are rewarded with honors, or at least take place in a context where they are susceptible of being rewarded with honors. Any representation of euergetism that fails to consider the honors awarded by poleis thus ignores a substantial aspect of the euergetic "phenomenon" as it is studied here.

This conception of euergetism might seem insufficient to describe many displays of munificence in the Roman world and late antiquity for which the term "euergetism" is also used, since these displays lack rewards in the form of honors. The definition can nonetheless embrace a wide geographical and chronological range, the Greek world from the archaic period to Roman imperial times. Nor does restricting the social manifestations to which the term "euergetism" can be applied increase difficulties of interpretation. To the contrary, using the same word to refer to very different realities runs the risk of emptying it of meaning. The definition "gifts to the community" is so broad, after all, that unless we set cultural and chronological limits, it is possible to talk, for example, of "Andean euergetism" (Veyne) or – and why not? – to identify political patronage in the United States as "contemporary euergetism."[8]

The idea that the phenomenon of euergetism is linked to public recognition by the polis and thus to reciprocity is more firmly anchored, whether consciously or not, among scholars than it might seem at first sight. Boulanger uses "euergetism" in relation to a historical context (the province of Asia during the first two centuries of the Roman empire) in which benefactors were honored as *euergetai*, and he indicates that the main evidence for euergetism is precisely the honorific inscriptions. Almost all the examples of euergetism provided by Marrou likewise come from honorific inscriptions. The period to which Veyne, followed by the vast majority of scholars, ascribes euergetism (300 BC–AD 300) coincides with the time when civic benefactors in the Greek world were honored by their fellow citizens; it is surely significant that no one regards the donations of the archaic elite, which are similar to those of the Hellenistic elite but lacking in honors, as examples of euergetism.[9] Gauthier, on the other hand, although he does not define euergetism, seems to conceive of it as a phenomenon characterized by the granting of honors; his work focuses on honorific inscriptions, pays more attention to honors than to

[8] Veyne 1969: 787. [9] Boulanger 1923: 25–6; Marrou 1948: 161–2; Veyne 1976a: 9.

benefactions, and (in contrast to Veyne) includes among the groups studied foreigners who did not perform actions that could be described as "gifts to the community" simply because they were honored as *euergetai*, a treatment that did not require being a public benefactor.[10]

Veyne did not, of course, overlook the possibility that euergetism might be defined as a relationship of reciprocity. In his 1969 article, he contemplates understanding that "the euergetes exchanges wealth for prestige or authority," and he adds that "it is a fact that sometimes euergetism creates complicated relationship networks between donors, plebs and city, who exchange gifts and honors." Nonetheless, Veyne rejects defining euergetism as "exchange," since he regards the relationship between the elite and the people, who gave prestige and power to the former, as "a series of actions and reactions" rather than as an exchange and maintains that relations between givers and recipients do not explain the causes of the phenomenon. But there is more. Veyne argues that defining euergetism as an "exchange" would be a "structuralist" interpretation.[11] Indeed, his book can be understood as an attempt to show that an important historical topic could be analyzed from a perspective different from that of the fashionable movements of the 1970s on "the rive gauche of the Seine."[12]

When Veyne states that euergetism is *not* about exchange, he means that no exchange between the giver and the demos could explain the causes of euergetism (understood simply as donations to the community). In Veyne's view, euergetism is thus not a consequence of an exchange of gifts for power. But this conception does not rule out using the term to refer as well to the exchange of gifts and honors – a real exchange, whose existence, as noted earlier, Veyne recognizes. This does not mean that the view of euergetism presented in this book is entirely compatible with Veyne's. I argue that there was in fact an *exchange* of gifts for power and authority. Furthermore, and without entering into a debate about the ultimate causes of donations to the polis (which is the topic of Veyne's book, not of mine), I maintain that exchange – the exchange of gifts and honors – explains at least one cause that motivated such gifts: the expectation of reciprocity.

This book thus starts from a notion of euergetism different from Veyne's and from that of many others who use the term as a synonym for "ancient munificence." But scholars today are also familiar with the

[10] Gauthier 1985.
[11] Veyne 1969: 794–5: "Explaining euergetism by means of structuralism could consist for example in saying that euergetism is exchange" (my translation; original text in French).
[12] Veyne 1969: 794.

notion that euergetism involved the exchange of benefactions and honors, even if this is generally not acknowledged overtly. In the chapters that follow, I use my definition in a consistent fashion: I never refer to the phenomenon of donations as "euergetism," nor do I qualify as such the exchange of benefactions for anything that does not include honors. (Political power, prestige, and other gains that may accompany the honors and even be the main incentive for the benefaction are not sufficient by themselves.) Instead, I reserve the terms *euergetai* and *euergesiai* for, respectively, benefactors and benefactions recognized as such by poleis, and I identify simply as "benefactors" individuals such as members of the archaic elite who contributed to their communities without receiving honors. I attempt to demonstrate that this view of euergetism as a practice ruled by a relation of reciprocity and as an "institution" allows us to explore the phenomenon of donations to the community from angles that diverge from the conception of euergetism as pure munificence. In particular, it allows us to recognize donations that were incorporated into non-institutional relations of reciprocity similar to those of euergetism, and to identify benefactions – conceived of as such by the ancient Greeks, and not only by us – that were not *euergesiai*, as well as *euergesiai* that were not real benefactions.

2 Why euergetism?

Most ancient historians would agree that euergetism is among the most distinctive features of the Hellenistic and imperial polis. To a considerable extent, this is due to the nature of our sources. We have few literary texts that describe polis life, but many inscriptions, a substantial portion of them decrees honoring benefactors, which are so widespread in the documentation as to create the image of an "euergetic society." But the importance of an institution like euergetism in scholarship cannot – or at least should not – depend simply on how well represented it is in the sources but on the place it occupied in ancient Greek society. If euergetism deserves our attention, it is because the institution is a fundamental link in our understanding of the ancient world. Its longevity (enduring at least 1,000 years, from the archaic age to the third century AD), its economic impact, and the role it played in relations between the elite and the demos, as well as between the polis and kings or emperors, all indicate that an investigation of euergetism is essential to understanding how the polis functioned and negotiated social and political conflicts. Indeed, the scarcity of public resources meant that without donations from benefactors, the polis

would have been unable to erect many of its public buildings and monuments, to celebrate festivals in the same spectacular fashion, or to assist those portions of the population most vulnerable to famines and the devastation of war. The government and administration of the polis relied on an elite that spent time, money, and resources on public offices. These contributions were not only decisive in making the polis work, for to the extent to which they were perceived as acts of solidarity rather than *hybris* – the difference, admittedly, was not always clear – they also helped release social tensions between rich and poor in an economically polarized society. On the other hand, the other key aspect of euergetism – the capacity of the polis to award honors – provided the demos with some power in its relationship with an elite that was looking for ways to compete, express its social superiority, and accumulate symbolic capital. For similar reasons, honors were an important device in the relationships between the polis and kings, royal officers, citizens of other poleis, and other external agents. The language and rituals of euergetism served to disguise relationships of domination both within the polis and between the polis and kings. They served, for example, to present the submission of the polis to a victorious sovereign as loyalty to a benefactor, and the tributes paid him as countergifts for benefactions, making more tolerable a relationship that was otherwise humiliating for the polis and discomfiting for the king.

The need for further study of euergetism ought thus to be clear even to readers who do not agree entirely with some of the observations made earlier.[13] But why a book on the *origins* of the phenomenon? The exhaustive monographs of Veyne and Quass cover the Hellenistic and imperial periods of euergetism.[14] But its earlier stages have been treated in detail only by Philippe Gauthier, whose main interest was in the transition from the fourth century to the Hellenistic age and the differences between early and late Hellenistic euergetism, not in the origins of an institution visible, as I will argue, already in the archaic period. There seem to be at least two reasons why the initial phase of euergetism has attracted little attention: the scarcity of early honorific inscriptions and the influence of Veyne's work, one of the main theses of which is that euergetism did not exist before Hellenistic times. On Veyne's view, the combination of psychological conditions and social pressures that generated euergetism

[13] Veyne 1976a: 9, 15, 184, believes that euergetism did not replace taxation and has nothing to do with redistribution of wealth and "depoliticization." A very different view is offered by Andreau, Schmitt, and Schnapp 1978, and Sartre 1991: 147–66.

[14] Veyne 1976a; Quass 1993.

was absent until the appearance of the "oligarchy of the notables" in the Hellenistic polis; in classical Athens, euergetism "did not exist."[15]

But study of the origins of euergetism makes sense not simply because "it fills a gap," but because it helps us understand the institution better. Many aspects of euergetism are recognizable and fully comprehensible only when the process of its emergence and expansion is considered. The notion of benefaction and its limits can be better understood in light of the debate about liturgies in Classical Athens, and with reference to the non-tangible counter-gifts attached to honors visible in the history of the reactions to gifts and services and the agonistic dimension of euergetism apparent among the first citizens officially recognized as *euergetai*. The reasons for rewarding benefactors with honors, the motives for awarding some of them honors and not others, the strategies employed to attract benefactions, the differences between the euergetism of foreigners and citizens, and the power relationships embedded in euergetism, all likewise become clearer when the origins of the phenomenon are analyzed and reconstructed.

Last but not least, behind the selection of a particular topic for historical inquiry is always a philosophy of history, some conception of the fundamental object and method of the enterprise, of *what* historians should study and *how*. Although there are most likely as many philosophies of history as historians, in the historiography of the past decades, three main approaches to the study of the human past can be discerned – and the suggestion that such a distinction is possible already indicates something about the philosophy of history behind this book. First, there are the heirs to the "linguistic turn," who focus on texts and the internal contradictions that make it difficult or even impossible to grasp the "reality" behind them. These authors emphasize that modern historical "reconstructions" suffer from the same constraints as many of their sources – the impossibility of depicting the past without invention – so that the difference between history and fiction is less clear than one might wish. Deconstruction, narrative history, rescue of "marginal" themes, explicit subjectivism, and careful attention to the form and style of scholarly writing are among the reactions to these challenges.

The second approach is far more optimistic about the possibility of historical knowledge. It concentrates on historical facts – what has existed or happened and can be verified through the traces it has left behind – and aims to reconstruct the human past in all its richness and diversity. This

[15] Veyne 1990: 71 (Veyne 1976a: 184). He deals with the "precedents" in a brief section entitled "Before euergetism" (Veyne 1990: 71–82).

approach highlights the particularities of each culture and society, the uniqueness of events, and the exceptionality of the historical sequence. It is less concerned with problems of objectivity, which it attempts to overcome through the application of honesty and common sense and is skeptical about the use of models and theories, which it regards as proper to the social sciences and thus, in a way, as the opposite of the historical disciplines.

These two approaches have in common an interest in plurality, be it within texts or within the "real" world. The third approach – the one from which this book is written – attempts to identify regularities, patterns, and principles behind the variety of human deeds. When it analyzes a society, it looks for structures, when it scrutinizes the historical process, for continuities. To draw a parallel with textual analysis, one might say that this conception is more interested in syntax than in semantics (the first perspective) or in the richness of vocabulary (the second perspective). Indeed, it assumes that some degree of generalization is one main goal of historical inquiry, and it accordingly relies on models and theories to explain the functioning and evolution of society. As a result, this approach is more deductive and less inductive than the others, and it tends toward a greater – but deliberate – degree of simplification. It nonetheless shares with the first view an interest in the objectivity/subjectivity question, and with the second a dedication to a search for positive knowledge.

Within this third approach, strategies that tend to use a social scientific methodology largely based on statistics as well on as models and theories of sociology, political science, and economics, should be distinguished from a *neo-modernist* perspective that pays more attention to the criticisms of the linguistic turn and is more closely related to historical anthropology than to the hard-core social sciences. My book takes its point of departure from this final standpoint and deals with an extended period of time (from the archaic age to the Hellenistic period), allowing for the detection of continuities such as the social practices that paved the way to the euergetic institution; basic principles of social relationships, including the rules of reciprocity; and structures based on these rules, such as the system of euergetism. I also pay considerable attention to oppositions and contradictions, which can be sources of social change as well as of stability. I accordingly differentiate between institutional practices and those not openly acknowledged by the polis; attempt to show that some things are not what they appear to be, while others are similar despite looking different; and interpret some seeming paradoxes as consistent actions.

3 Precedents and debts

Before the popularization of the term "euergetism," scholars examined "philanthropy," "beneficence," and "charity." For many years, they concentrated their attention on Christian charity, but that changed with the publication of Hendrik Bolkestein's pioneering *Wohltätigkeit und Armenpflege im vorchristlichen Altertum* (1939). Using predominantly literary evidence, Bolkestein argued that the most interesting difference is not between Christian and pagan attitudes to charity, but between Greco-Roman beneficence ("Wohltätigkeit") and the charity of the Near East (Egypt and Israel); the former was directed toward citizens, the latter – like Christian charity – toward the poor, the reason for the difference being the greater gap between rich and poor in Near Eastern societies. Bolkestein also explored the orientalization of Greco-Roman beneficence, a process he took to be related to increasing political, social, and economic disparities in the Roman Empire, and which he argued helped explain the origins of the Christian notion of charity.

Although Bolkestein's interpretations were not universally accepted, the monumentality and erudition of his book seem to have discouraged other scholars from undertaking general studies of ancient philanthropy for almost 30 years, in part because the writing of history was in this period a highly positivist enterprise and Bolkestein seemed to have collected most of the evidence. Not until 1968 was a new survey published: Arthur R. Hands' *Charities and Social Aid in Greece and Rome* (1968), which continues the scholarly tradition of focusing on assistance to the poor and also offers a comparative approach. In Hands' book, however, the comparisons are not between two ancient cultures but between the conceptions of the Greeks and the Romans (not treated separately, as by Bolkestein), on the one hand, and modern ideas of the welfare state and the Elizabethan law of charity, on the other. Hands accepts Bolkestein's division between oriental and classical philanthropy and admits that the classical world does not have the same emphasis on pity for the poor as in Christian culture. But he also stresses that this does not exclude the existence of actions from which the needy benefited, actions directed to both private individuals and the whole community. Two aspects of Hands' work are of particular interest for the present project. First, despite relying largely on literary sources, he incorporates considerably more information from inscriptions than Bolkestein did. Second, Hands pays attention to the obligations created by gifts and relates this aspect of his study to the work of Marcel Mauss.[16]

[16] See in particular the chapter "Giving for a Return" (Hands 1968: 26–48).

The publication of Paul Veyne's *Le pain et le cirque* in 1976 marked a turning point in research on ancient philanthropy. As noted earlier, Veyne's central topic was not assistance to the poor but the phenomenon of gift-giving to the community – what he called "euergetism." Compared with the work of Bolkestein and Hands, Veyne's topic was broader, in that it included any type of public gift, regardless of its consequences for the poor, but also narrower, in that gifts to individuals were excluded on the assumption that a clear distinction can be drawn between services to the collectivity and services to individuals. Veyne's claim that euergetism had not previously been studied[17] is not to be taken literally, for attention to "gift-giving to the community" is an important part of the monographs of both Bolkestein and Hands, which Veyne cites only *en passant*.[18] It is nonetheless true that euergetism is never to the foreground in those works, and that neither uses the term "euergetism." Veyne also draws a clearer line between euergetism and Christian charity. He does not investigate possible evolutions of euergetism toward forms of beneficence similar to Christian ones, since he is uninterested in historical processes or in the interplay between continuities and discontinuities. Nor is Veyne interested in comparison with other ancient cultures; his object of study is purely Greco-Roman. Finally, as noted previously, he does not pursue Hands' interest in reciprocity but concentrates on the individuals who give (the notables), a perspective that had tremendous influence on the conception of euergetism in later scholarship.

But Veyne's book is far more than a study of euergetism. It is the application of a theory of history presented in *Comment on écrit l'histoire* (1971) and *L'inventaire des differences* (1976), two programmatic works that must be read together with his study of euergetism. Assigning Veyne's work to one of the three theories of history discussed earlier is difficult, because he works from a Weberian perspective unusual for historians and shares aspects of all three approaches (although not in equal proportions). Veyne believes that the focus of history, unlike that of the social sciences, is the particular rather than the general, so that what sociologists consider *examples* of generalizations are the ultimate object of history. But he is not a positivist; he works not with facts but with concepts. What Veyne attempts is to grasp the particular through the fabrication of general concepts that allow recognition of multiple variants, and he defines his

[17] Veyne 1976a: 22: He makes this claim in a paragraph that has been removed from the English version (cf. Veyne 1990: 11).

[18] He refers to Bolkestein's book as a work on "assistance and charity in the Roman world" (Veyne 1976a: 22; the reference does not appear in Veyne 1990: 11).

approach as a combination of "sociological history" and "historical sociology."[19]

To the previous discussion of the enormous influence of *Le pain et le cirque* and some of the reasons for it should be added the observation that its impact is also a consequence of the many criticisms to which the book gave rise. Maurice Sartre's words give some idea of the virulence of the debate:

> It is useless to repeat in its entirety the criticism surrounding the work of Paul Veyne: blurry temporal landmarks, random usage of vague concepts and shifting definitions, lack of rigorous terminological analysis, inconsistent definition of the very concept of euergetism, disdain for sociological as well as anthropological analysis, etc. To all this, we have to add that it is somewhat unsettling to reduce a social phenomenon of such scope to a mere mechanism of individual psychology. Of course, psychology does have a part to play: the munificence lavished by some, the stinginess demonstrated by others are factors that have an impact on levels of donation. However, to assert that euergetism's driving force is to be found in personality traits alone boils down to a denial of its collective nature, of its existence as a societal component which fulfills needs beyond those of individual impulses.[20]

The criticisms came, essentially, from Paris,[21] and from two different "camps": from non-positivist historians working from a sociohistorical perspective closer to the Annales school, Marxism, and anthropological structuralism than to Weberian postulates; and from ancient historians specializing in Greek inscriptions. Thus Jean Andreau, Pauline Schmitt, and Alain Schnapp published a long review article in the *Annales*, in which they tried to show the misconceptions and inconsistencies of Veyne's argumentation. Philippe Gauthier for his part gave voice to the reactions of specialists in inscriptions. To them, euergetism was anything but new; they had been working on several aspects of the phenomenon for years and had generated impressive studies such as Bernhard Laum's two-volume *Stiftungen in der griechischen und römischen Antike* (1914). After Gauthier's work, they continued to contribute to the understanding of euergetism with general treatments of the subject such as Friedemann Quass' *Honoratiorenschicht in den Städten des griechischen Ostens* (1993), as well as with less comprehensive studies such as Léopold Migeotte's *Les souscriptions publiques dans les cités grecques* (1992). In the pages that follow, it will

[19] Veyne 1976a: 11–13. [20] Sartre 1991: 163 (my translation; original text in French).
[21] But see also the negative review in Millar 1978.

become clear how much our knowledge of euergetism owes to the "epigraphists."

But the present book is also in debt to a different scholarly tradition: anthropological work on gift-exchange. The fact that despite Hands' approach, this tradition has had little effect on the study of euergetism is not due to its lack of influence in the field as a whole: when in the 1950s Mauss' *Essai sur le don* (1923–1924) began to become one of the most widely read texts in anthropology, it had an impact on an entire generation of classicists, from Moses Finley and his disciples to Sally Humphreys.[22] This influence is still apparent, as the conferences on *The Gift in Antiquity* at Brown University in 2010 and on *Gift Giving and the "Embedded" Economy in the Ancient World* at the Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften in 2012 demonstrate.[23] Indeed, Mauss' ideas about the obligations derived from gifts and about the elementary laws of gift-exchange continue to be fundamental to our understanding of Greek gift-exchange. From the extensive literature drawing on Mauss, I have relied in particular on Maurice Godelier's and Marcel Hénaff's discussions and reformulations of the Maussian theory; on Marshall Sahlins' work on reciprocity, especially his distinction between balanced ("direct") and generalized ("indirect") reciprocity, and his observations on how status differences shape reciprocity; and on Pierre Bourdieu's reflections on the role of time in gift-exchange.[24]

4 Generosity and interest

Whether or not the pure gift – one made with no expectation of reciprocation – exists in any given society, is a matter of great controversy. We have only to compare Jacques Derrida's thoughts on the question with those of Emmanuel Levinas to see how antithetical the answers can be.[25] But despite the importance given to reciprocity in this book, I do not aim to engage in this debate; my concern is with social practices and public discourses, not the psychology of the ancient Greeks. My arguments that Greek gift-giving was more strongly dominated by reciprocity than it is in modern Western society and that the institution of euergetism was grounded in this social mechanism belong to this level of analysis and do not imply that in ancient Greece the unselfish gift did not exist. Nor should

[22] Finley 1978; Humphreys 1978. On Mauss, cf. Liebersohn 2011.
[23] Satlow 2013; Carlà and Gori 2014.
[24] Sahlins 1972; Bourdieu 1990: 98–111; Godelier 1999; Hénaff 2010; Hénaff 2013.
[25] Levinas 1969; Derrida 1992.

my emphasis on reciprocity overshadow the fact that gift-exchange in Greece, as elsewhere, was not a commercial exchange but an activity imbued with the idea of generosity (whether genuine or pretended is another question). The fact that the gifts exchanged were different, and that it was impossible to calculate exactly to what degree they were equivalent in value, created the impression that both sides engaged in gift-exchange with no concern for benefits and losses. Moreover, the counter-gift was normally not only *different* but *deferred*,[26] which meant that the person who gave first suffered a loss to benefit the other without being sure he would be compensated. The one who gave in return, on the other hand, could not always cancel his debt by giving an equivalent gift – "equivalent" because despite the difficulties just mentioned, there was calculation on both sides – for sometimes he needed to reciprocate with a superior counter-gift that would run the same risk as the initial gift of being inadequately compensated. In other words, at times the only way to cancel a debt was through equivalent generosity, and this process transformed gift-exchange into an "exchange of generosities."

This combination of interest and generosity was possible thanks to individual and collective self-deception, a form of what social scientists call "common knowledge," which was in a way the reverse of common knowledge, and which Bourdieu explains in his analysis of gift-exchange:

> No one is really unaware of the logic of exchange (it constantly surfaces in explicit form, when for example someone wonders whether a present will be judged sufficient), but no one fails to comply with the rule of the game which is to act as if one did not know the rule. We might coin the term "common miscognition" to designate this game in which everyone knows – and does not want to know – that everyone knows – and does not want to know – the nature of the exchange.[27]

If gift-exchange required playing this game, euergetism and the proto-euergetic forms of gift-exchange that preceded euergetism and coexisted with it did so even more. The status differences between the agents involved in euergetism (normally demos, elite, and kings), the openness with which they pursued their interests through gifts, and the magnitude of some of the expected counter-gifts (large donations, political subordination) required considerable doses of (self)-delusion to preserve the aura of generosity that surrounded such transactions. In the pages that follow, therefore, I frequently distinguish between two levels of exchange, the

[26] Bourdieu 1990: 105. [27] Bourdieu 1997: 232.

institutional or "imaginary" one and the non-institutional or "real" one. I deal with benefactions and rewards that were not officially recognized; with benefactions that, on the contrary, were mere inventions of the polis; and with gifts that were presented as rewards in return for benefactions that never occurred. But "common miscognition" alone does not explain these "abnormalities." They were possible, above all else, because euergetism was in essence gift-exchange and shared with gift-exchange the same logic and ambiguity – a logic that allowed, for example, the performance of a benefaction to be anticipated, and an ambiguity that sometimes made it difficult to determine whether certain contributions were gifts or counter-gifts. My investigation of euergetism begins with a study of such questions, and with an apparent paradox – the rewards in public subscriptions – that offers the best means to answer them.

5 Greek history and gift-giving

In the past three decades, new approaches, models, and interpretations have arisen in Greek history – especially in research on earlier periods – that encourage further study of Greek gift-giving. Although the majority of these proposals do not focus on gift-giving, it follows from them that the practice is more important for our understanding of ancient Greek society than has been thought so far.

One of the most deeply rooted ideas in scholarship on ancient Greece, the notion that in the archaic period, the upper layer of society consisted of aristocrats, has been challenged. Scholars such as Robin Osborne and Alain Duplouy criticize the fact that what for the ancient Greeks was a form of government – *aristokrateia* ("the rule of the best") – has been transformed by modern historians into a closed social order based on birth.[28] At the top of the archaic society would have been a far more dynamic and permeable social group that ought to be defined simply as "elite." Its members occupied an unstable position and needed to negotiate their authority, increase their prestige, and invest in the resources needed to stay on top.[29] Two aspects of this model are particularly interesting for the subject of this book. First, gifts are not only a reflection of social status but also important elements for maintaining (or acquiring) such status: first, they allow the giver to gain reputation, establish alliances with peers, and subordinate

[28] Duplouy 2006; R. Osborne 2009: 209–10, 354. Cf. Rose 2012: x; Hall 2014: 134–7; Wekowski 2014: 19–26.
[29] Duplouy 2002; Duplouy 2006.

other individuals in a world with more social mobility than in earlier models. Second, this model reduces the differences between Homeric *basileis*, archaic "aristocrats," and classical polis-elite. It accordingly invites us to think of the top layer of the society in terms of continuities, and thus to conceive the continuity of gift-exchange as a feature inherent to the elite beyond the Homeric period.

To offer gifts required wealth, and wealth – particularly its role in social hierarchization – has also generated considerable interest in recent scholarship. It has been suggested that in the archaic period, economic success was perceived as an important quality: people sought wealth not only for access to material benefits and power, but also because of its prestige. Gifts and the aims they pursued required wealth; therefore, obtaining the prestige derived from wealth demanded gifts (demonstrative expenses).[30] From what has been said so far, not only about wealth but also about the elite, one might already deduce another preferred theme of recent scholarship: competition, not so much to acquire scarce commodities as to be superior to others. That the Greeks had an agonistic mentality is not a new thesis, but in some recent contributions this has become the basis of a model of historical change.[31] The study of the impact of Greek competitive culture leads inevitably to the study of gift-giving, since this was a major social area in which members of the elite could challenge one another (the more difficult it became for the elite to compete in war, politics, and athletics, the greater the importance of gift-giving as an agonistic activity became). In the following pages, the close relationship between euergetism and competition will become apparent: not only did members of the elite strive to make gifts to the community, but official prizes for several competitions contributed to instituting rewards for benefactions of citizens, and such rewards came to function, in turn, as prizes in an euergetic contest.

The dynamic, fluid conception of archaic society and its elite reflected in these models and interpretations is in part a consequence of the effect of postmodern approaches to historiography in the past 30 years. Most scholars working on the Homeric poems, however, have come to similar conclusions from outside this paradigm. While Moses Finley imagined that the Homeric world was still far from the archaic city, in recent scholarship this distance has been reduced more and more, so that Homeric gift-exchange increasingly appears as a feature of early archaic society.[32] On the other hand, increasing attention has been paid to

[30] Ulf 2009; van Wees 2009. [31] Fisher and van Wees 2011.
[32] Raaflaub 1998a; van Wees 2013: 17; Hall 2014: 23–5.

reciprocal relationships in post-archaic times. The volume *Reciprocity in Ancient Greece* sought to demonstrate the significance of such relationships in different periods and areas of Greek culture.[33] One aspect that has been studied is the continuity of ritualized friendship or *xenia* (either as a survival of aristocratic culture or as an appropriation by the polis for the benefit of the entire community).[34] Interestingly enough, results produced by scholars working on the other chronological end of Greek history – the Hellenistic period – also point to the need to explore continuities in the practice of gift-giving: the Hellenistic poleis were neither as "decadent" as Veyne and others imagined nor did their finances function as badly as has traditionally been assumed.[35] Hellenistic euergetism thus seems to have deeper roots than the economic needs of the Hellenistic polis, roots that lead us to focus on the historical role of gift-giving in organizing Greek society. At the same time, researchers working on the final period of classical Athens (the years after the Social War, and the Athens of Lycurgus) have stressed that the financial structure of Athens at this time was close to the Hellenistic one,[36] underlining the need to look at continuities in the evolution of gift-exchange. But historians dealing with fifth- and fourth-century Athens have also contributed of late to a state of scholarship that encourages the study of gift-exchange. I am thinking in particular of the fresh debate on the civic obligations and degree of altruism of Athenians citizens, which helps frame some of the questions dealt with in this book.[37]

While some scholars have emphasized the similarities between the elites of the different periods of Greek history, others – the majority – are still interested in identifying change. From their work, however, we can also draw interesting lessons for the study of gift-giving. Ian Morris' contributions in this regard are particularly useful. Morris sees a profound change in the eighth century, giving rise to two opposing ideologies, a "middling" ideology and an "elitist" ideology. To prevent kingships from arising, a portion of the elite in Greek poleis would have become favorable to overcoming the old separation between elite and non-elite and to accepting the existence of a more or less homogenous community of men – the polis citizens – distinguished from foreigners, slaves, and women. This middling

[33] Gill, Postlethwaite, and Seaford 1998. See also Satlow 2013; Carlà and Gori 2014.
[34] Herman 1987; L. Mitchell 1997.
[35] Veyne 1976a. Cf. Dmitriev 2005; Grieb 2008; Zuiderhoek 2009; Carlsson 2010; Mann and Scholz 2012; Wiemer 2013.
[36] Faraguna 1992; Hakkarainen 1997; Azoulay and Ismard 2011.
[37] Christ 2006; Herman 2006; Liddel 2007; Christ 2012.

ideology would have been characterized by promotion of a sense of solidarity and mutual interest.[38] From this perspective, gifts to the community and the establishment of organized forms of serving the polis through liturgies – the prehistory of civic euergetism – are easier to understand. But this does not mean that the elitist ideology, that is, that of those who tried to differentiate themselves from the rest of the community by arrogating to themselves divine connections and exploiting their contacts with elites from other places was an obstacle to gifts. The elitist ideology did not prevent gifts between members of the elite – quite the contrary – but neither did it prevent gifts to the community as a way to express and increase the distance from the demos. In Greek society, as in any society, gifts to those of lower rank produced contradictory effects that allowed gift-giving to appeal to opposed ideologies: gifts brought the two parties closer by expressing solidarity, but simultaneously separated them by demonstrating the differences between them.

The trend in research on archaic Greece to focus on the elite, either examining its division into two ideological groups, as Morris does, or studying it from the point of view of competition (the struggle to become part of the elite, but also to stand out within it) is part of a general tendency of historians to concentrate on elites, which is visible in work on other periods of Greek history.[39] This tendency has not prevented some historians, however, from looking at the rest of the society not simply as the non-elite, but as a group with its own interests, distinct group consciousness, and some degree of coordination. Hans-Joachim Gehrke, for instance, has analyzed the power of the demos and poleis assemblies in the seventh and sixth centuries. Others have turned their attention to questions such as the role of lawgivers as arbitrators in disputes between the elite and the demos (not only among elite members), the role of the tyrants in the same context, the emergence of more or less democratic governments in poleis such as Athens and Syracuse as a result of elite/demos conflict (not as a consequence of the middling ideology), the distinction between elite and demos in the archaic poets, and even the possibility of speaking of a class struggle, as Peter Rose does.[40] Scholars such as Josiah Ober,

[38] Morris 2000; Morris 2007; Morris 2009.

[39] In addition to the literature previously cited, see Capdetrey and Lafond 2010, which includes contributions on classical and Hellenistic elites. On classical elites, see also Tiersch (forthcoming). On Hellenistic elites, see Cébeillac-Gervasoni and Lamoine 2003 (esp. Savalli-Lestrade 2003); Łoś and Nawotka 2005; Dreyer and Mittag 2011. On elites in the Roman period and Late Antiquity, see Salzman and Rapp 2000; Cébeillac-Gervasoni and Lamoine 2003; Łoś and Nawotka 2005; Bartels 2008.

[40] V. Parker 2007; Gehrke 2009; Rose 2009; Wallace 2009; Rose 2012; Hall 2014.

Christian Mann, and Claudia Tiersch, moreover, have deepened the study of the communication and interaction between elite and demos in Athens in the fifth and fourth centuries.[41] All this leads to attention to gift-giving because of its importance in relationships of power.[42] As we shall see, gifts were used by both the elite and the demos to manipulate the other party, becoming important instruments in the domination strategies of both groups. The history of the tensions between the demos and the elite is full of gifts and counter-gifts, actions to force donations and to prevent them, discourses to assert their existence and to deny it, and rhetoric to define gifts as good or bad. Gift-giving was not only a field for competition between individuals eager for honor but also a territory for confrontation (and negotiation) between the two main groups of the polis. This final aspect of gift-giving constitutes the focus of this book.

[41] Ober 1989; Ober 1998; Mann 2007; Tiersch (forthcoming). [42] Domingo Gygax 2013.

CHAPTER 1

Synchronic approaches

1 The paradox of public subscriptions

In the late Hellenistic period, Hippucome, a small polis in northwestern Lycia, decided to build a public bath. This was an unusual undertaking, since baths for public use in Greek poleis were normally owned by private individuals, but approximately eighty citizens and a few alien residents promised to pay for the construction. According to the inscription reporting the event, Hippucome then decided to honor the future givers by offering them public praise and a gold crown, and by inscribing their names on a stele to be consecrated in the sanctuary of the gods Loandeis.[1]

The fact that honors were granted individuals who had only *promised* money may seem surprising, since it does not fit with the usual conception that honorific decrees were issued to reward services *rendered*. One might accordingly think that the word *epangellô* ("to promise") is a scribal error or a simple betrayal of the author's subconscious: While referring to people who had in fact paid up, he imagined the moment when the assembly of Hippucome decided to build the bath and canvased those present for their willingness to make contributions. But the Hippucome inscription is not the only instance of a polis honoring individuals who had merely promised money in a public subscription (*epidosis*). Léopold Migeotte's corpus of *epidosis*-inscriptions includes decrees from Messenia and Olymus that also honor those who promised contributions,[2] and Crannon, Lindus, Cos, and Colophon all similarly passed decrees calling for public subscriptions in which it was declared that those who promised to contribute would be

[1] *TAM* II 168 = Migeotte 1992: no. 80. On the question of whether the inscription belongs to the second or the first century BC, see Wörrle 1988: 121; Migeotte 1992: 153; Zimmermann 1992: 88 n. 141. On Greek baths, see Migeotte 1992: 255. On the number of subscribers, see Tietz 2003: 252–4.

[2] Migeotte 1992: nos. 22 (Messenia, *ca.* 15 BC–AD 14), 75 (Olymus, second half of the second century BC).

honored.[3] In all these decrees, the main honor consists of the inscription of individual names on stelae (less frequently walls), sometimes accompanied by public praise. In addition, we have four lists of individuals who promised to make contributions, preceded by a prescript indicating that the publication of names was conceived as an honorific gesture.[4] Clearly these cannot all be "mistakes." Instead, the inscriptional evidence reflects a practice, relatively widespread in time and space, of honoring individuals who promised contributions to public subscriptions.

How can this practice be explained? Above all else, how could individuals who had only promised contributions have been named in honorific stelae? As Migeotte observes, "the commemorative monument was, by definition, intended to render homage to the benefactors of the city [those who had already fulfilled their benefactions]: it would have been paradoxical, and offensive for the other subscribers, to allow the names of the failing subscribers to appear alongside those who had fulfilled their promises."[5] Scholars who engage with this problem generally argue that the verb *epangellô* ("to promise") and its corresponding substantive *epangelia*, together with other equivalent lexical items found in *epidosis*-inscriptions, should not always be taken literally. Migeotte's thesis is that such words, "by referring to a solemn promise, could end up including the idea of donation," that is, that the promise referred to had in fact been converted into a donation. Similar conclusions were reached by Adolphe Künzi, who believes that these words can refer to "the fulfillment of a promised contribution," and Bernhard Laum, who maintains that decrees dealing with *epangeliai* are always testimonies to the fulfillment of promises.[6]

But close examination of inscriptions referring to public subscriptions contradicts this thesis, which is based more on "common sense" – ours, not the ancient Greeks' – than on evidence. As a starting point, it is worth considering an inscription of the polis of Crannon in Thessaly, which sometime between 179 BC and 142 BC sought to eliminate its debts by raising a public subscription and passed a decree in which it resolved:

[3] Migeotte 1992: nos. 34 (Crannon, 179–142 BC), 41, 50 (Cos, between 205 BC and 201 BC), (Lindus, AD 22), 69 (Colophon, *ca.* 311–306 BC).

[4] Migeotte 1992: nos. 23 (Megalopolis, 220/10 or 170/169 BC?), 81 (Tlos, end of the first century BC), 83 (Simena, beginning of the first century BC); 84 (Termessus, AD 165). The inscriptions that consist of a list of individuals who had made promises, without a prescript phrased in clear honorific language, are also considered rewards by Migeotte 1992: 286 and 326: nos. 37, 38, 43, 45, 52, 67, 73, 78, 79. I comment on this interpretation later.

[5] Migeotte 1992: 326 (my translation; original text in French).

[6] Migeotte 1992: 209, 326, 399 (quoting Robert 1929: 122–3 n. 4 = Robert 1969: 1088–9 n. 4, originally in French); Künzi 1923: 59; Laum 1914: vol. 1, 119–20.

That those who wish should promise (*epangellô*) to the polis in the assembly the sum each wishes to contribute as a gift for the aforementioned debts; that the promise should be made while Crateraeus holds the office of general; that *the polis should praise those who made such a promise so that it should be manifest to all that the polis remembers its benefactors (*euergetai*); that the treasurers should take care that those who have promised should give the money to the polis as promised.*[7]

The text refers to honors bestowed in return for the promise of future contributions: the citizens are rewarded with public praise and treated as *euergetai* in the assembly where they make their promises, before the treasurers set about securing payment. Evidently this reward is not of the same rank as a stele. But it is symptomatic of a willingness of Greek poleis to respond to promises of contributions with honors.

The same attitude is reflected in an inscription from Cos, which sometime between 205 BC and 201 BC asked its inhabitants for donations to "defend the polis."[8] Volunteers had to declare their intention of making a donation in the assembly, and the demos voted in each case for or against acceptance; the names of "those whose donations had been accepted" were to be inscribed on three stelae. I examine what this might mean later. For the moment, what is worth noting is that it was also decided that those whose promises of gifts were rejected would be "registered" (*katachrêmatizô*).[9] This cannot be interpreted, as some have suggested, as a form of punishment,[10] since it makes no sense to punish individuals for having offered something the demos declined to accept.[11] The provision should rather be understood (as Migeotte and Ivana Savalli propose) as a reward for the offer, an honorific measure that involved registering the names in question in the city archives or perhaps exhibiting them in a temporary public list.[12] Apparently the polis did not want to leave unrewarded volunteers whose contributions were rejected in a system presumably conceived to maximize the size of the public subscription.[13]

[7] Moretti 1967–1975: no. 99 = Migeotte 1992: no. 34.
[8] Paton and Hicks 1891: no. 10 = Migeotte 1992: no. 50 = *IG* XII, 4, 1, 75.
[9] On the meaning of this term, see Savalli 1985: 402; Migeotte 1992: 152–4.
[10] This is the interpretation of Sherwin-White 1978: 179–80, based on Is. 5. 36–8 (followed by Ellis–Evans 2013: 113).
[11] The Isaeus passage (5. 36–8) cited by Sherwin-White (1978): 179–80, in support of the view that this is conceivable, refers to a very different situation: the display of a public list of names in Athens to punish individuals who had not fulfilled promises in a public subscription.
[12] See Savalli 1985: 402; Migeotte 1992: 152–4; Domingo Gygax 2009: 168; Chaniotis 2013: 96, 99.
[13] The polis may have expected that some people, out of fear of having their gifts rejected, would decide to donate more than what they might have otherwise, and that the extra money thus collected would more than compensate for any rejected contributions.

If, in the course of a public subscription, individuals whose promises of contributions were rejected could be the objects of such a distinction, some poleis may well have inscribed on stelae the names of individuals who made promises likely to be fulfilled. Evidence that this was so is found in the following inscription from Colophon dating to 311–306 BC:

> In order that the citizens provide the most possible funds for the walls, the people have decided: that any of the citizens who is willing promise (*hypodechomai*) the sum each one wishes to give, and that the promise (*hypodexis*) be open to those who are currently absent; as regards those who have promised to make a donation, the people shall deliberate in the month of Lenaion, in the main assembly, the best way to honor every individual who has made such a promise, in a manner worthy of their zeal, in the way the people decide; *to inscribe on a stone stele the names of all who have promised and the quantities promised by each individual and to erect the stele* in the sanctuary of Meter here; *of the money promised, each donator shall pay, at the time the works on the walls are assigned, one third of the total sum promised*.[14]

The text leaves little doubt that Colophon decided to honor with a stele individuals who promised money even before they made the first payment of a sum scheduled to be delivered in a series of installments.[15] So too a list of subscribers from Smyrna, which contains the names of individuals who promised to contribute to the construction or reconstruction of public buildings, refers to one subscriber as having *already* made his contribution,[16] whereas the others are only said to have promised one. The distinction only makes sense if, at the time their names were inscribed, the individuals described as having promised to contribute had not yet fulfilled their promise but were simply expected to do so.[17]

Equally revealing is a set of honorific inscriptions declaring that subscribers "have promised and *given* (*didômi*),"[18] "have promised and *contributed* (*syneispherô*),"[19] or "have fulfilled the commitment in line with their promise."[20] The insistence on the fact that these individuals had not only promised but paid suggests that the poleis regarded it as

[14] Maier 1959–1961: no. 69 = Migeotte 1992: no. 69. For other translations and commentaries, Hellmann 1999: 29–31; L. Meier 2013: 362–8.
[15] The way in which Maier 1959–1961: 230 reconstructs the process confirms this interpretation.
[16] *I. Smyrna* 697 = Migeotte 1992: no. 67 (lines 43–5).
[17] Migeotte 1992: 209 attempts to explain the distinction by assuming that the person said to have contributed had done so before the commencement of the public subscription and perhaps even initiated it.
[18] Migeotte 1992: nos. 25, 58, 60, 76. [19] Migeotte 1992: no. 66. [20] Migeotte 1992: no. 40.

expedient to add this information. Perhaps they thought that if they only wrote that the citizens "had promised," this might be taken to imply that the achievement consisted solely of making a promise, since it was equally proper to set up stelae inscribed with the names of those who merely agreed to make contributions. So too in the case of the inscription from Cos discussed earlier, in which promises of contributions made by the individuals in the assembly had to be submitted for approval by the demos,[21] the magistrates are ordered "to have the names of those who have been accepted engraved on the stelae." This formulation does not feature the ambiguity attributed by some scholars to the phrases involving the words *epangelia* and *epangellô*. Instead, it clearly refers to people who only promised contributions. Moreover, the list includes a few individuals who promised to contribute in kind, by means of products to be offered for sale. The value of these contributions is specified, but Migeotte observed that the value probably corresponds to the assembly's estimate before the products were sold, since the quantities are given in round numbers.[22] This lends further support to the notion that we are dealing with a list of promises rather than final contributions, in which one would expect the value of the completed sales to appear.[23]

I now return to the situation in Hippucome.[24] According to the inscription, the stele with the names of the individuals who promised to pay for the construction of the bath was set up with the intention of encouraging others to contribute to the project as well. Did the polis wait until all the approximately eighty subscribers fulfilled their promise before erecting the stele? It seems more likely that it took the initiative based on the promises, since the stele itself – not the decision to erect it – was expected to attract new contributors. In addition to the list of individuals who had made promises, moreover, the inscription offers another list of about sixty-five names written in a different letter-style and in irregular lines, which was clearly added after the stele was set up, although not much later, since many letter-forms are similar. This list perhaps contains the names of individuals who contributed during the process of collecting the money originally promised, as well as the names of those who contributed thereafter, in both cases subsequent to the creation of the monument. For their engagement "at the last moment,"

[21] Paton and Hicks 1891: no. 10 = Migeotte 1992: no. 50 = *IG* XII, 4, 1, 75.
[22] Migeotte 1992: 157.
[23] Otherwise we would need to assume either that the polis did not care about the accuracy of the sum or that by the time it inscribed the names of the contributors who had paid, it had still not sold the products.
[24] *TAM* II 168 = Migeotte 1992: no. 80.

these new givers were rewarded with the inclusion of their names on the monument.[25]

However the situation in Hippucome is interpreted, inscriptions recording public subscriptions from elsewhere leave no doubt that Greek poleis sometimes granted honors, including stelae, to individuals who during the process of fundraising merely promised contributions. How are we to explain the existence of such a "singular" practice? Why did poleis run the risk that some individuals would fail to fulfill their promises, a circumstance that would have been an affront to those who had kept their word and whose names would be listed on the stele alongside those of the defaulters? And why were promises rewarded with such disproportionately high recompense?

The answer to these questions is, in principle, simple: it was in the city's best interest to grant honors that may seem excessive to us, and to risk the possibility that the stelae might ultimately include the names of individuals who had not contributed, because at the end of the day this practice helped achieve the main objective of holding a public subscription, that is, to encourage subscribers both to make a commitment and to honor it. Individuals who promised money – including wealthy landowners – did not always have enough cash available, after all, and a relatively long time might pass between a promise and its fulfillment. Thus in Colophon, the contributions were paid in several installments, and in an *epidosis* of Halasarna (Cos), subscribers were given a year to make their payments in three installments.[26]

Lists such as these were public documents of promises made, and in that sense were records of contractual obligations that opened the possibility of pursuing individuals for unfulfilled promises (a problem some inscriptions report).[27] A passage of Demosthenes suggests that in fourth-century Athens, a failure to fulfill promises made in the assembly could be punished

[25] The sums of money were not registered, possibly because it was considered unnecessary to specify the amount once it had been paid. It has been suggested that the second list might record the names of individuals who, at the time the promises were made, did not know how much they would give, or of priests and magistrates who had nothing to do with the subscription (see *TAM* II 16; Migeotte 1992: 257–8), but these interpretations are problematic (Tietz 2003: 253). On the similarities and differences between the letters in the two lists, see Tietz 2003: 253–4, who does not hesitate to conclude that the names in the first list are individuals who had just promised ("künftige Spender") but thinks that the second list might refer to people who contributed materials or workers instead of money. Cf. Migeotte 1992: no. 75, an inscription from Olymus that records a subscription that took place in at least three stages. Olymus did not wait until the end of the procedure to inscribe the names of the subscribers but inscribed them after each stage.

[26] *IG* XII, 4, 1, 94. R. Parker and Obbink 2001: 253–65.

[27] Migeotte 1984: no. 102; Migeotte 1992: 284.

with death.[28] So too Isaeus says that since a certain Dicaeogenes did not pay what he had promised, his name was displayed in a list of defaulters in front of the statues of the Eponymous Heroes under the heading: "These are those who voluntarily promised the people they would contribute money for the salvation of the polis and failed to pay the amounts promised."[29] Migeotte's corpus of inscriptions includes an example of a provision against possible defaulters accompanying a list of individuals who had promised to serve for free as *hierothytai* in Lindus and states that defaulters will be prosecuted for impiety.[30] But beyond measures such as these, in a world dominated to a considerable extent by a shame culture, the publication of promises must itself have been an efficient device to dissuade individuals from breaking them.[31]

What matters more for our inquiry is that the inscribed lists of names were not merely records of promises. This is at least the case in ten inscriptions in Migeotte's corpus that clearly indicate that the publication of names was an honorific measure. In most of these inscriptions, the prospective donors are called *euergetai* or are depicted as benefactors with expressions such as "those who have shown their zeal (*philotimia*) toward the people." Sometimes the publication of the names goes hand in hand with rewards such as public praise, crowns, or honors "worthy of their zeal," and in one case (Hippucome) the gesture was intended to stimulate others to emulate those who had already made pledges.[32] An inscription from Termessus reads: "The people have honored through this inscription those who have promised."[33] An inscription with the names of subscribers was thus indeed, as Migeotte observed, a "commemorative monument . . . intended to render homage to the benefactors of the city."[34] This may also have been the case with inscriptions that do not present the publication of names as a reward.[35] According to Migeotte, the main reward was to have

[28] D. 20. 100: "You know there is a law making death the penalty for anyone who breaks his promise to the assembly or one of the councils or law-courts. You have our guarantee, our promise. Let the archons record it, and let the matter rest in their hands" (tr. Vince).

[29] Is. 5. 36–8 (tr. Forster). Cf. Wyse 1904: 463, and Migeotte 1992: 13, on this passage and other possible cases of publication of the names of defaulters.

[30] Migeotte 1992: no. 41.

[31] Hands 1968: 40, adds further arguments: "In the Greek world, of course, the motive for publishing the subscription-lists was, as much as anything, to indicate those who had *not* contributed and remind them of their shocking omission, according to the standard of *homonoia.*"

[32] Migeotte 1992: nos. 22, 23, 34, 41, 69, 75, 80, 81, 83, 84. [33] Migeotte 1992: no. 84.

[34] Migeotte 1992: 286, 326. See also Hands 1968: 40: "The wealthy of the Greek city-state . . . gave 'gifts,' which, however near-obligatory in character, had their reward in the publicity of the subscription-list, quite apart from any other public honors."

[35] Migeotte 1992: nos. 37, 38, 43, 45, 52, 67, 73, 78, 79.

one's name inscribed on a durable monument, while the text of the decree ordering the inscription had less significance and was probably displayed on a wooden panel.[36] This hypothesis is confirmed by the fact that some inscriptions that reproduce the names of subscribers who not only promised but paid similarly do not portray the publication of the names as a reward, although there is no doubt they had an honorific character.

No matter how threatening the measures against defaulters were – we have little evidence on such matters – and no matter how binding public promises could be in a shame culture, promises were not equivalent to contributions, as is proven by the fact that some individuals failed to do what they had pledged. Thus scholars who consider promises unworthy of honorific stelae appear to be right. But such stelae were nonetheless awarded, because the honors themselves (and not only the record of the commitment) helped bring about the realization of the promises. An explanation of how this worked requires consideration of aspects of Greek euergetism that have not been taken into account either by scholars who deny the existence of inscriptions in honor of individuals who had only made promises or in studies of euergetism generally. My focus will be on the principles of reciprocity on which euergetism was founded; the historical and structural links of the practice to gift-exchange; the existence of institutional and non-institutional levels in the exchange of benefactions and rewards; and the multiple possibilities in the interaction between benefactors and recipients offered by the game of euergetic reciprocity when combined with these levels of exchange. From this more complex point of view, honors for promises in subscriptions no longer appear paradoxical but can be seen as a logical consequence of euergetism. As I argue in what follows, the "paradox" of public subscriptions is related to under-studied aspects of the vagueness of the distinction between benefaction and reward, the fragility of the balance in the relationship between benefactors and recipients, and the strategies used by both parties to tip that balance to their own advantage.

2 Structures and principles

2.1 Gifts and counter-gifts

Euergetism, understood as the institution that involves the exchange of benefactions and honors, has its roots in an ancient principle of Greek

[36] Migeotte 1992: 286.

culture: that, as a general rule, a gift – I use the word in a broad sense to include both goods and services – induces the recipient to respond with a counter-gift. "To give" thus implies "to receive," just as "to receive" implies "to give." Epicharmus, the fifth-century Syracusan comic poet, illustrates this correlation with a beautiful if now commonplace image: "One hand washes the other."[37] This principle is found in many premodern societies, as Marcel Mauss has shown, and in modern society as well. Who never felt the need to reply to a gift? Up to a point, therefore, the tendency to reciprocate gifts is a universal one, and human interaction is to a considerable extent all reciprocation.[38]

Nonetheless, significant differences exist between our world and that of the ancient Greeks with regard to gifts and the reactions they provoke. For us, what characterizes a gift is – in theory – its gratuity; a donation consists of an action that merely enriches the recipient and does not need to be reciprocated. When someone thanks us for a gift, therefore, we generally reply with expressions such as "not at all," "*de rien*" or "*di nulla*."[39] In certain contexts, we can receive gifts without feeling forced to reciprocate; in others, although we would like to reciprocate, we forgo doing so, so as not to violate the "purity" of the gift. Alternatively, we reciprocate with a response that is not really a counter-gift but a simple gesture of gratitude. At times, our personal feelings mean that we cannot avoid reciprocating, but we prefer to conceal the fact that our action is intended as a counter-gift. There is also some shyness about openly reciprocating certain services. And it is almost always improper to request a counter-gift.

In the Greek world, by contrast, the idea that a gift was not free predominated. The giver often did not hesitate to remind the recipient that he expected something in exchange. "You owe me a return of good service for the benefits I have done you," said Herodotus' Croesus to Adrastus, while Thucydides' Themistocles sends the message to Artaxerxes, "There is a *euergesia* due me."[40] This does not mean that a donation was perceived as straightforwardly intended to enrich the donor himself, as with the exchange of goods in a commercial transaction. To the Greeks, a donation was also an act of generosity: it entailed the risk of not being reciprocated, or of being reciprocated in a way unworthy of the gift. To avoid undermining the generosity attached to the gift, it might be better in some situations to renounce asking for a counter-gift, as we

[37] Epich. fr. 211 ap. [Pl.] *Ax.* 366c (tr. Cooper).
[38] On the "universality" of the phenomenon, see Gouldner 1960: 171.
[39] Van Wees 1998: 19.
[40] Hdt. 1. 41; Th. 1. 137.

read in a passage of Demosthenes that simultaneously shows how obliged the recipient was to reciprocate:

> My view is that the recipient of a benefit ought to remember it all his life, but that the benefactor ought to put it out of his mind at once, if the one is to behave decently, and the other with magnanimity. To remind a man of the good turns you have done to him is very much like a reproach.[41]

The reasons why in modern Western society gifts do not have the same implications as they do in ancient Greece are too complex to be analyzed in depth here. I would simply observe that in the West today, the diffusion of the notion of the gratuity of the gift is in part related to Christian ethics and in part to the modernity of the economy and the state. The development of openly self-interested commercial exchange and the redistribution of wealth through direct taxes and public services, for example, have contributed to the creation of spaces for the "pure" gift. In the Greek world, by contrast, the fact that many economic, social, and political activities worked through the exchange of gifts left less space for this kind of gift. For the smooth functioning of society, it was important that there be no ambiguity in the obligation to reciprocate gifts, which were thus more closely associated with exchange.

Sources from many periods reflect the importance of the principle of responding to gifts with counter-gifts. Believing Odysseus to be dead and the man before him a foreigner, Homer's Laertes tells his unrecognized son, "for if you had found him [Odysseus] still alive in the land of Ithaca, then would he have sent you on your way with ample requital of gifts and good entertainment; for that is the due of him who begins the kindness."[42] Hesiod advises: "Be friendly to your friend, and go visit those who visit you. And give to him who gives, and do not give to him who does not give." The Platonizing author who cites Epicharmus' dictum "one hand washes the other" interprets the phrase as "give something and take something." Another author in the Platonic tradition defines a gift (*dôrea*) as an "exchange of favors." Aristotle observes in the *Nicomachean Ethics* that "goodwill is indeed rendered in return for favors received, but this is merely the payment of a due," while the Ps.-Aristotelian *Rhetoric to Alexander* contains a remark that perfectly summarizes how common it was to

[41] D. 18. 269 (tr. Vince).

[42] *Od*. 24. 283–6 (tr. Murray). On the exchange of gifts in the Homeric world, see Finley 1978: 61–2, 64–6, 96–8, 120–3, 137; Austin/Vidal-Naquet 1972: 56–7; Donlan 1981/82: 137–75; Scheid-Tissinier 1994; von Reden 1995; Wagner–Hasel 2000; Seaford 2004: 23–6, 34–47; Ulf 2009: 87; Seaford 2011; Bertelli 2014.

reciprocate gifts: "Men always give presents in the hope of receiving some benefit or as a recompense for former benefactions." Similar patterns appear in works of fiction, such as the *Cyropaedia*, wherein Cyrus – described by one modern scholar as someone whose "virtues are a rehearsal of standard Greek aristocratic values" – exclaims: "so now, my men, it seems to me that we should be doing what is fair, if we gave Gadatas, our benefactor, our heartiest assistance; and at the same time we should be doing only what is right in paying a debt of gratitude."[43] Finally, consider an episode narrated by Herodotus:

> The Lacedaemonians, who had already heard of the oracle given to Croesus, welcomed the coming of the Lydians and swore to be his friends and allies; and indeed they were bound by certain benefits which they had already received from the king. For the Lacedaemonians had sent to Sardis to buy gold, with the intent to use it for the statue of Apollo which now stands on Thornax in Laconia; and Croesus, when they would buy it, made a free gift of it to them. For this cause, and because he had chosen them as his friends before all other Greeks, the Lacedaemonians accepted the alliance. So they declared themselves ready to serve him when he should require, and moreover they made a bowl of bronze, graven outside round the rim with figures, and large enough to hold twenty-seven hundred gallons, and brought it with the intent to make a gift of requital to Croesus.[44]

What induced individuals to reciprocate gifts with counter-gifts? In the Greek world, as in most premodern and modern societies, gifts generated mixed feelings in the recipient. On the one hand, the recipient felt that he was the object of an act of solidarity (the giver shared something he possessed with the one who received) and of generosity (the giver renounced something for the benefit of the one who received).[45] On the other hand, receiving a gift generated a feeling that in certain times and places (especially Athens in the classical period) could even be considered "negative": the recipient felt indebted to the giver and, as a consequence, dependent on him until the debt had been paid. This feeling – which represented a kind of spontaneous, provisional counter-gift[46] – was the primary reason for reciprocation. Its roots were diverse. First, the gift reminded the recipient of the giver, as is apparent from several passages in the *Odyssey*: "I will give you a beautiful cup, that you may pour libations to the immortal gods, and remember me all your days." And further on:

[43] Hes. *Op*. 353–5 (tr. Most); Epich. fr. 211 ap. [Pl.] *Ax*. 366c (tr. Cooper); Pl. *Def*. 414a (tr. Cooper); Arist. *EN* 1167^{a}14–16 (tr. Rackham); [Arist.] *Rhet. Al*. 1446^{b}36–8 (tr. Rackham); X. *Cyr*. 5. 3. 31 (tr. Miller). The comment on Cyrus' values is from von Reden 1995: 86.
[44] Hdt. 1. 69–70 (tr. Godley with alterations). [45] Godelier 1999. [46] Von Reden 1995: 18.

"Menelaus . . . shall bring gifts and set them on the chariot, and shall send us on our way with kindly words of farewell. For a guest remembers all his days the host who shows him kindness."[47] There was in addition the pressure exerted by the giver and, depending on the circumstances, the rest of the community as well, who expected or even demanded a counter-gift. (Laertes does not doubt that the man he assumes to be a foreigner expects something in return: "all in vain did you bestow those gifts, the countless gifts you gave."[48]) The following passage from Herodotus shows both the giver's demand to be reciprocated and the recipient's concern about repaying a debt. Syloson (the giver) initially appears upset when he thinks that he has given something for which he will never receive a return; when he sees a chance to be compensated, he does not hesitate to remind the recipient (Darius) of his debt:

> This Syloson had a stroke of good luck. He was in the market at Memphis wearing a red cloak, when Darius, at that time Cambyses' spear-bearer and as yet a man of no great account, saw him, and coveting the cloak came and offered to buy it. When Syloson saw Darius' eagerness, by good luck he was moved to say, "I will not sell my cloak at any price; but if it absolutely must be so, I give it to you." To this Darius agreed and took the garment. Syloson supposed that he had lost his cloak out of foolish good nature. But in time Cambyses died, the Seven rebelled against the Magian, and of the Seven Darius came to the throne; Syloson then learned that the successor to the royal power was the man to whom he had given at request the garment in Egypt; so he went up to Susa and sat at the king's porch, saying that he was Darius' benefactor. When the gate-ward brought word of this to the king, "But to what Greek benefactor," Darius asked, "can I owe thanks?" In the little time since I have been king hardly one of that nation has come to us, and I have, I may say, no need of any Greek. Nevertheless bring him in, so that I may know his meaning."[49]

Our sources also include numerous references to the sense of inferiority of the recipient versus the giver, a feeling the following passage from Hesiod presents in "radical" terms:

> Give is good, Grab (*Harpax*) is bad, a giver of death. For whatever a man gives willingly, even if it is much, he rejoices in the gift and takes pleasure in his spirit; but whoever snatches, relying upon shamelessness, this congeals his own heart, even if it is little.[50]

[47] *Od.* 4. 592; 15. 54. See also *Od.* 1. 309–13; 8. 431 (tr. Murray).
[48] *Od.* 24. 283–6 (tr. Murray). As for the pressure of the community, see Thgn. 573–4.
[49] Hdt. 3. 139–40 (tr. Godley). [50] Hes. *Op.* 356–60 (tr. Most).

Hesiod's point is sometimes taken to be that the person who steals freezes the heart of the man stolen from.[51] But he more likely means instead that stealing freezes the heart of the thief.[52] The opposition is not between the pleasure of voluntary giving and the grief of being robbed or between the facts that giving makes friends, while stealing produces enemies.[53] There is a contrast between a morally good action (giving) and a bad one (stealing), but also, as Paul Millett observes, "between the unhappiness of the man who takes (verses 359–60) with the happiness of the man who gives (verses 357–8)."[54]

A passage from Pericles' funeral oration offers another example of this dimension, which is fundamental to understanding the tendency to reciprocate gifts. The opposition is between the good disposition toward the recipient of the individual who gives – since his generosity makes the other man dependent – and the bad disposition toward to the giver of the person who receives – because his counter-gift is not regarded as an act of generosity but as paying off a debt:

> Now he who confers the favor is a firmer friend, in that he is disposed, by continued goodwill toward the recipient, to keep the feeling of obligation alive in him; but he who owes it is more listless in friendship, knowing that when he repays the kindness it will count, not as a favor bestowed, but as a debt repaid.[55]

[51] Paley 1861: 45, translates: "whosoever takes of his own accord, complying with a shameless disposition, small though it be, that (a thing taken) grieves the heart (of him from whom it is taken)." See also Mazon 1914: 94; Hays 1918: 135; von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1928: 83; Marg 1970: 323; West 1978: 247: "Hesiod . . . must be referring to the effect on the man robbed. . . . The point is that you enjoy giving voluntarily, even a lot, but you do not like it if the other man takes even a little on his own initiative"; Verdenius 1985: 174–5; Tandy and Neale 1996: 88–9.

[52] This is the most common interpretation. See Evelyn-White 1914: 29; Mazon 1928: 99; Sinclair 1932: 39; Nicolai 1964: 81; Bona Quaglia 1973: 204; Athanassakis 1983: 76, 97; Hamilton, Rainis, and Ruttenberg 1988: 17; Schirnding and Schmidt 2002: 111; Most 2006: 117; Schlegel and Weinfield 2006: 68, 95; Cassanmagnago 2009: 360, 371, 960; Nelson and Caldwell 2009: 83; Morrissey 2012: 86; in particular Ercolani 2010: 93, 266–7. In verses 364 ff. (which in Most's edition follow immediately after 355–60), Hesiod mentions again that to desire what one does not have has negative consequences for the spirit of the person who does so: "it is fine to take from what you have, but it is woe for the spirit to have need of what you do not have." See also verses 320 ff., where he says that the person who steals is punished by the gods.

[53] West 1978: 247; Mazon 1914: 94.

[54] Millett 1984: 102. Sinclair 1932: 39, comes to the same conclusion: "As giving rejoices the giver, so taking destroys the taker's peace of mind." See also Athanassakis 1983: 97; Cassanmagnago 2009: 960; Ercolani 2010: 266–7.

[55] Th. 2. 40. 4 (tr. Smith). The translation of this passage is problematic. Millett 1991: 123, and von Reden 1995: 88, represent the contradiction as similar to the one I have mentioned. If one follows instead Rhodes 1988: 85, Missiou 1992: 117, and Missiou 1998: 190–1, the contradiction is between the good disposition of the person who receives without being forced to reciprocate, and the "bad" disposition of the one who receives and must reciprocate.

This passage appears between two sentences that seem to indicate that, according to Thucydides' Pericles at least, the Athenians granted favors without expecting anything in return, and that because of this the recipients did not feel indebted.[56] But such behavior is presented as an anomaly, and nothing suggests that the beneficiaries did not feel in debt all the same.

The discomfort that proceeded from being unable to reciprocate a gift is apparent in the following passage from the *Cyropaedia*. Having been offered several gifts by Gadatas, Cyrus accepts only the horses and rejects the rest:

> But do you take these other things away and keep them until you see me in possession of wealth enough so that I shall not be outdone in requiting you. For if, as we part, you should give me larger gifts than you receive from me, by the gods, I do not see how I could possibly help being ashamed.[57]

Finally, Xenophon attributes to Socrates a sentence that could not be clearer in regard to the dependency gifts arouse: "Who [is] in the world more free, for I accept neither gifts nor pay from anyone?"[58] To understand the basic mechanisms of euergetism, however, we must also take into account some additional characteristics of the exchange of gifts in the Greek world.

Disjunction

In contrast to a commercial transaction, gift-exchange did not involve a deadline for reciprocation: individuals could respond immediately, as heroes in Homeric poems[59] or representatives of states in diplomatic relations occasionally do.[60] But often the response might be forthcoming only after a much longer interval. While in our society the time that separates a gift from a counter-gift helps maintain the notion of gratuity, in ancient Greece it served to present gift-giving as an act of generosity despite the hope for a counter-gift.[61] This also allowed the possibility that an unforeseen circumstance, such as the death of the recipient during the intervening period, could prevent the giver from being reciprocated. This is what Laertes in *Odyssey* 24 believes has happened to the foreigner: as a result of the presumed death of Odysseus, he has been left without counter-gifts.[62] According to Herodotus, the same thing happened to Croesus after his gift to the Lacedaemonians. Consistent with his historical

[56] Missiou 1998: 190–1; Herman 1998: 210. [57] X. *Cyr*. 5. 4. 32 (tr. Miller). [58] X. *Ap*. 16.
[59] *Il*. 6. 219–20, 234–6; 7. 287–305; *Od*. 21. 31–5. For an example from a later time, X. *HG* 4. 1. 39.
[60] See Knippschild 2002. [61] On the question of time in gift-giving, cf. Bourdieu 1990: 98–111.
[62] *Od*. 24. 283–6.

method of presenting alternative versions of events, Herodotus dwells on the accidents that might have prevented the counter-gift from being given:

> This bowl never came to Sardis, and for this two reasons are given: the Lacedaemonians say that when the bowl was near Samos on its way to Sardis, the Samians found out and descended upon them in warships and carried it off; but the Samians themselves say that the Lacedaemonians who were bringing the bowl, being too late, and learning that Sardis and Croesus were taken, sold it in Samos to certain private men.[63]

But the disjunction was not only temporal. The recipient might reciprocate with a counter-gift of a different kind, whose value was not precisely equivalent to that of the gift. Thus in the Homeric poems, Iphitus gives Odysseus a bow, and Odysseus reciprocates with a sword and stout spear, while Oeneus gives Bellerophon a belt bright with scarlet and receives a two-handled cup of gold.[64] This disjunction also helped increase the notion of generosity, since it transmitted the idea that neither party was calculating who was obtaining more benefits.

Equivalence

Behind this image of flexibility, there was nonetheless calculation on both sides. To pay off his debt, the recipient had to reciprocate with a counter-gift at least equivalent to the original gift, while the giver, to feel properly reciprocated, expected such a response. The world of Boeotian peasants struggling for subsistence provides Hesiod with a motive for openly recommending what many Greeks had in mind in the exchange of gifts: "pay him back well, with the very same measure, and better if you can." Only an equivalent or greater counter-gift would make the giver feel reciprocated. Xenophon relates how a Greek living in the court of the king of Thrace explained that "the greater the gifts you bestow upon this man, the greater the favors that you will receive at his hands."[65] This assessment reveals the relation between the dimension of the gift and that of the counter-gift. Yet to estimate an equivalence was complex, not only because gifts and counter-gifts were of different natures, but also because other aspects besides material value were taken into consideration. The value of the gold cup Bellerophon gave Oeneus, for example, lay not

[63] Hdt. 1. 70 (tr. Godley).
[64] *Od.* 21. 31–5 and *Il.* 6. 219–20, respectively. On the difference between gifts and counter-gifts and the lack of accuracy in the equivalences, see Gouldner 1960: 175; Bourdieu 1990: 98–111; Seaford 1998: 3; van Wees 1998: 26.
[65] Hes. *Op.* 349–51 (tr. Most); X. *An.* 7. 3. 20 (tr. Brownson).

only in the material it was made of but also in its symbolic value as an "instrument of drinking and libation, hence of conviviality, hospitality, and of cementing trust and loyalty."[66]

Also important were what the detachment of the object or the accomplishment of the service meant for the giver and obtaining the gift for the recipient. Aristotle in the *Eudemian Ethics* is aware of the importance of these factors and deliberates about which plays a larger role: "Indeed it is a question in which of two ways one ought to judge what is a just return, whether by looking at the actual amount or quality of the service rendered, or by its amount or quality for the recipient."[67] As a consequence, items or services of very different "objective" values could have a similar value in gift-exchange. Herodotus explains how Darius rewarded Syloson in a way that, in principle, might seem disproportionate, but that, as Darius makes clear in his explanation, was merely equivalent in terms of generosity. Herodotus also relates that Syloson refused the gift Darius offered him. But most remarkable is that he did so not because he thought the counter-gift out of proportion to his gift, but because he wanted a different, equally disproportionate counter-gift:

> "Most generous man," said Darius, "you are he who made me a present when I had as yet no power; if it was but a little thing, yet it was as thankworthy as if someone now gave me a great gift. In response I give you abundance of gold and silver, that you may never repent of the service you did Darius son of Hystaspes." Syloson answered, "Do not give me either gold, O King, or silver; only win me back my fatherland of Samos."[68]

Just as significant for the estimation of equivalences were previously acquired debts that had not yet been reciprocated. In the *Iliad*, "his belt bright with scarlet" is Ajax's simple counter-gift, by which he reciprocates Hector's "silver-studded sword with its scabbard and well-cut baldric" after the latter interrupted their fight. The proposal to postpone combat was Hector's, and when the fighting was interrupted, Ajax was winning. At the moment Hector initiated the exchange, he was thus in debt on account of Ajax's acceptance of an interruption that was to Hector's advantage. Ajax's counter-gift reflects this awareness.[69] But the risk assumed by the giver of not being reciprocated adequately or at all, as well as the waiting time itself,

[66] Donlan 1989: 11; see also Duplouy 2006: 174–6, 181; Domingo Gygax 2007: 120–2; Allan and Cairns 2011: 123.

[67] Arist. *EE* 1243^{a}15–17 (tr. Rackham). Cf. Aristotle's considerations in the *Nicomachean Ethics* on "proportionate exchange": Arist. *EN* 1132^{b}–1133^{b}.

[68] Hdt. 3. 140 (tr. Godley).

[69] *Il.* 7. 287–305. On Ajax's advantages, see Donlan 1989: 10–11; Postlethwaite 1998: 94.

could lead the recipient to add a "plus" to the counter-gift. In the example from Hesiod, behind the recommendation to respond "with the same measure or *better*" was most likely not only the intention of indebting the person from whom one had received, but the idea that, in some cases, the risks taken by the giver and the time he had spent waiting for compensation meant that a superior counter-gift was necessary to pay off the debt.[70]

Imbalance

The habit of responding with counter-gifts of a different nature and an imprecise equivalence made it difficult to reestablish a balance in the relationship between giver and taker. The donor might consider the counter-gift superior or inferior to his gift – we have seen how Aristotle in the *Eudemian Ethics* mulls over the difficulties of evaluating adequate correspondence – or the recipient might take advantage of the disjunction surrounding the counter-gift to deliberately unbalance the relationship in his own favor, but without drawing attention to his intentions.[71]

Rebalancing could also be impeded, on the other hand, with a counter-gift openly superior to the gift. Although the recipient might perceive the indebtedness caused by receiving a gift as something negative (as in Hesiod, Thucydides, and Xenophon), to reciprocate in an exaggerated fashion was often regarded as a token of generosity and favorably received by the recipient if he was interested in continuing the relationship with the giver. Thus Cyrus says in the *Cyropaedia*: "For if we should show everyone that . . . we surpass in well-doing those who do well by us, the consequences of such conduct would be that many would wish to become our friends."[72] In the famous passage of the *Iliad* in which Homer remarks that Glaucus had lost his mind when he reciprocated the bronze given by Diomedes with gold, the point is not that it is unacceptable, in principle, for a counter-gift not to be equivalent to the gift, but that in this context a counter-gift "worth one hundred oxen" for a gift "worth nine oxen" is inappropriate: it is disproportionately superior, or perhaps the situation simply did not require a superior counter-gift.[73] The exchange between Bellerophon and Oeneus, on the other hand, is an example of a reasonable superior counter-gift (gold for leather) and requires no comment by the poet, since

[70] Hes. *Op*. 349–51. Cf. Millett 1984: 101; Millett 1991: 33; Edwards 2004: 95–7, 100–101.
[71] On the imbalance in the exchange of gifts in general, see Gouldner 1960: 175; Sahlins 1965: 223; van Wees 1998: 26.
[72] X. *Cyr*. 5. 3. 32 (tr. Miller). [73] *Il*. 6. 234–6. Cf. Herman 1987: 60–2; Bertelli 2014: 116–18.

Bellerophon's counter-gift reflects his desire to ensure his friendship with Oeneus.[74]

The facility with which a counter-gift could tip the balance in the opposite direction rather than rebalancing the relationship between the parties gave rise to what anthropologists call "alternating disequilibrium,"[75] and to chains of gifts and counter-gifts (which does not imply that such sequences could not also reflect other concerns, particularly a mutual interest in maintaining an ongoing relationship). Another example from the *Cyropaedia* aptly illustrates this phenomenon: Cyrus gives Cyaxares "many splendid presents," and Cyaxares responds by giving Cyrus his daughter and "a golden crown and bracelets and a necklace and the most beautiful Median robe that could be found." Cyrus accepts, "but still he made the young lady presents of everything that he thought would please Cyaxares as well as herself."[76]

2.2 *Euergetism and gift-exchange*

Just as gifts induced individuals to give in return, gifts to the polis compelled the community of citizens to compensate with counter-gifts. I again use the term "gift" to refer to goods and services, which in this case – when the gift is addressed to the polis – I call "benefactions." In addition, I understand a "gift to the polis" (or "benefaction") to be a contribution that when made by a citizen rather than a foreigner was perceived by the community as a contribution that went beyond what was owed, that is to say, beyond what a member of the community was morally obliged to contribute to the polis in exchange for the advantages derived from belonging to the group (military defense, access to communal land, participation in religious rituals, etc.). In my judgment, this, rather than the question of whether the contribution was voluntary or a legal imposition, was the primary difference between a gift or benefaction and the duty of a citizen. As we will see, a liturgy was an obligatory service but could be perceived as a benefaction, whereas the fulfillment of a magistracy, despite being voluntary, could be perceived as a duty.

The community of citizens responded to benefactions with counter-gifts of various kinds: obedience to the elite to which the benefactors belonged or to the king who was the author of the benefaction, political support for

[74] *Il.* 6. 219–20. Cf. Donlan 1989: 11–12; Graziosi and Haubold 2010: 139–40.
[75] Van Wees 1998: 26.
[76] X. *Cyr.* 8. 17–20 (tr. Miller). On this passage, see von Reden 1995: 86–7.

the benefactor in the assembly of citizens, acquittal in popular trials, and the like. Another possible counter-gift was public recognition of the benefaction as *euergesia*, accompanied by the granting of honors such as statues, crowns, or honorific stelae – which is to say, the type of counter-gift that, on my definition, leads to talk of euergetism. Like donations to individuals, benefactions created a feeling of indebtedness in the recipient. Thus Lycurgus describes what in Athens around the year 330 BC aroused – or should have aroused, in his opinion – a sense of communal indebtedness toward a fellow-citizen: "To earn your gratitude he must . . . have been distinguished as a trierarch, or built walls to protect his city, or subscribed generously from his own property for the public safety." In contrast, "horsebreeding, a handsome payment for a chorus, and other expensive gestures do not entitle a man to any such recognition from you, since for these acts he alone is crowned, conferring no benefit on others."[77]

This communal sense of indebtedness had the same roots as that felt by an individual who received a gift. Benefactions evoked the benefactor. Public buildings called to mind the donors, simultaneously serving a purpose in the community as architectural landmarks. Periodic festivities evoked memories of the individuals who instituted them, and military and diplomatic triumphs were engraved in the collective memory along with the names of those who helped achieve them. A reflection of the memory left by benefactions can be seen in inscriptions, which often refer to the act of remembering the benefactors' deeds; that it was judged appropriate to include such references is symptomatic, regardless of whether the sentiments expressed were sincere. Thus Xanthus honored the Ptolemaic chief of the garrison "so that all [could] see that the polis of the Xanthians [was] able to remember those who [had] done good for the polis," and Ptolemy III says to this same polis: "We congratulate you for never failing to maintain the same feelings and for remembering with recognition the benefactions you have received from me, my father and my grandfather."[78]

As in the case of gift-exchange, the feeling of indebtedness associated with euergetism was partially the result of pressure from the "environment." Other poleis and the citizens of the receiving polis expected the beneficiary community to fulfill its obligation to reciprocate. Particularly in the case of a benefaction by a fellow-citizen, the citizens of the receiving polis saw themselves not only as recipients of a benefaction but also as "spectators"

[77] Lycurg. 1. 138–40 (tr. Burtt).

[78] Robert 1983: 126; Bousquet 1986: 22–4 (*SEG* XXXVI 1218). See also Moretti 1967–1975: no. 99 = Migeotte 1992: no. 34; *Syll.*^{3} 317 (Austin 2006: no. 32); *OGIS* 223 = *RC* 15 (Austin 2006: no. 173).

of a relationship between the polis and the benefactor. Demosthenes insists on the importance of Athens showing that it customarily rewards its benefactors, an idea that recurs in numerous Hellenistic inscriptions.[79] Thus the polis usually justifies the granting of honors in its decrees with statements such as "so that it may be manifest to all that the people know how to return (*apodidômi*) adequate thanks (*charites*) to benefactors for the services they have performed," or "so that the people might be seen by all to be showing its gratitude."[80] Similar remarks appear in the letters of kings honored as benefactors. Eumenes II, for example, wrote to the Ionian League: "You passed a resolution in order that you might always be seen to be repaying worthy honors (*timai*) to your benefactors."[81]

The individual who performed a benefaction for the polis, like the one who made a donation to an individual, expected something in return. This too contributed to arousing a feeling of indebtedness. Numerous inscriptions reflect this attitude among benefactors. In the examples cited earlier, poleis make a point of saying that they know how to reward their benefactors not only to demonstrate that they have fulfilled an obligation but also to send a message to potential future benefactors: if they perform benefactions, their expectation of being rewarded will not be frustrated. Some inscriptions state explicitly that the guarantee of a reward is precisely what draws benefactors: between 230 BC and 220 BC, Histiaea awarded honors to a Rhodian "so that all may know that the people of Histiaea [know] how to honor their benefactors and *more people may compete to provide benefits to the polis when they see worthy men being honored*." In a decree of Seleucia in Pieria from 186 BC, we read that "the polis should display its gracious welcome to the zeal and benefactions of such men, so that others, realizing what returns those who seek to do good obtain from the polis, may be keen to help the citizens."[82] The benefactor's awareness of his right to reciprocation could even lead him to request a reward. At least from the fourth century on, Athenian citizens could ask the city's council and assembly for honors, a procedure that also existed in other poleis in the Hellenistic age.[83] The Athenian decree promulgated in

[79] D. 20. 64.

[80] *Syll.*³ 374 (Austin 2006: no. 54) and *OGIS* 267 II (Austin 2006: 229). Other examples: Wörrle 1975: 59–60; *Syll.*³ 317, 354, 401, 493; Herrmann 1965a: 33–6 = Ma 2002: no. 17; Herrmann 1965b: 73–4 = Bringmann and von Steuben 1995: no. 284 [E 1]; Robert 1983: 126; T. L. Shear 1978a: 2–4 (*IG* II³ 911); *IG* XII, 5, 129; *OGIS* 10 = *I. Ephesos* 5, 1453; *OGIS* 339; *RC* 45; *SEG* II 663.

[81] *OGIS* 763 = *RC* 52 (Austin 2006: no. 239).

[82] Histiaea: *Syll.*³ 493 (Austin 2006: no. 115). Seleucia in Pieria: *RC* 45 (Aus. 176). Other similar cases: *OGIS* 213, 339; T. L. Shear 1978a: 2–4 (*IG* II³ 911).

[83] Gauthier 1985: 83–5, 112–4, 127–8.

honor of Phaedrus of Sphettus (mid-third century), for example, contains a reference to the "honors Phaedrus has requested (*aiteô*) be awarded."[84] The same practice is attested for foreigners in Athens already in a speech by Lysias delivered in 410 BC: "If some foreigner had come and . . . asked to be recorded as your benefactor, you would have granted his request."[85] Two Hellenistic Athenian decrees honor foreign benefactors who requested, respectively, the privilege of owning real estate (*enktêsis*)-and *proxenia* and *enktêsis*, "in accord with the law" (*kata ton nomon*). In Halicarnassus, a third-century inscription reports that a foreigner (apparently a *proxenos*) went to the council and the assembly, pointed out his benefactions to the polis, and asked for *enktêsis*.[86]

The normal lapse of time between the gift and the counter-gift in euergetism also opened up the possibility that interference of some sort could jeopardize the counter-gift. A famous example is Aeschines' frustrated attempt to prevent the award of a gold crown by the demos to his rival Demosthenes for the latter's financial contribution to the mending of the walls.[87]

In contrast to the medals and honorific titles that modern states award to citizens for having "served the homeland," which are simple manifestations of gratitude aimed at symbolizing the state's debt toward the person being honored rather than canceling it, euergetic honors, like counter-gifts, aimed to reestablish a balance in the relationship with the benefactor and pay off the debt generated by the benefaction. For this reason, poleis emphasize that they are awarding "adequate" (*axiai*) honors/thanks (*timai/charites*), or that they have honored a "worthy (*axios*) man": in other words, the honors awarded match the level of the benefactions, or the benefactor is deemed worthy of this level of honor.[88] Poleis also express their intention "not to fall short (*leipô*) in returning gratitude."[89] It seems likely that in some cases these declarations were purely rhetorical, and that in practice the polis did not achieve its objective. But in other cases – even when we do not find statements of this kind – such efforts surely

[84] *IG* II² 682 = *Syll.*³ 409. Also see Aeschin. 3. 236.
[85] Lys. 20. 19 (tr. Lamb). This example, however, concerns a type of honor for which citizens could normally not apply. The honor of being registered in the list of benefactors was in nearly all poleis restricted to foreigners. See Gauthier 1985: 18–20.
[86] Daly 2007: 240–5 (*SEG* XLVII 111); *IG* II² 907; Halicarnassus: Şahin 1976:20–1 (*SEG* XXVI 1223).
[87] Aeschin. 3; D. 18.
[88] Examples include *SEG* II 663; *Syll.*³ 374; *OGIS* 763 = *RC* 52; *IG* XII, 5, 129; Herrmann 1965a: 33–6 = Ma 2002: no. 17; *Syll.*³ 493. See also Herrmann 1965b: 73–4 = Bringmann and von Steuben 1995: no. 284 [E 1]: *harmozousai timai*.
[89] *OGIS* 339 (Sestus). Cf. İplikçioğlu 2008: 117–18.

succeeded; we should not underestimate the value of the rewards the polis had to offer. Privileges such as citizenship, the right to own land (*enktêsis*), and freedom of entry into and exit from the harbor could be enormously beneficial to foreigners who resided in a polis or had commercial relations with it. Honors such as stelae, *proedria* (permanent seats of honor at performances), and statues, besides satisfying the recipient's *philotimia*, represented symbolic capital that could be transformed into political and economic goods. In addition, euergetic honors were sometimes combined with nonofficial counter-gifts, such as political support or military subordination, that could contribute decisively to reestablishing the social balance between the two parties.[90]

Further comparisons

The preceding analysis of the many factors involved in evaluating equivalences in the exchange of gifts – the symbolic value of the objects, the cost of the gift to the giver, its benefits for the recipient, previously acquired and still uncanceled debts, risks for the giver, and waiting time – was intended to demonstrate that in the institution of euergetism, benefactions and rewards that to us may not seem equivalent did so to the ancient Greeks. The same factors or similar ones played a role in the evaluation of euergetic equivalences. But the awareness that in the exchange of gifts all these factors had an influence also helped the Greeks imagine that benefactions and honors were equivalent, even when they were not or when it was impossible to assess their equivalence. The disjunction resulting from the difference between the exchanged elements could serve to create around the exchange the image that neither party paid attention to the equivalence of gift and counter-gift, an image of unselfishness. But the disjunction resulting from the factors involved in estimating equivalence could also help convey a feeling of balance that was sometimes as fictitious as the unselfishness itself.

Some sources demonstrate the concern poleis had to reward their benefactors with counter-gifts precisely equivalent to their benefactions. In fourth-century Athens, there seems to have been intense debate about this matter. Some people believed that benefactors were receiving exaggerated rewards compared with those given in the fifth century, which still appeared adequate to them.[91] Demosthenes expresses these ideas in a passage from his *Against Aristocrates* that also illustrates some

[90] On the correlation between the magnitude of the benefaction and the size of the reward, see Habicht 1970: 206–13.

[91] D. 23. 196–203; D. 20. 112–16; [D.] 13. 21–2; Aeschin. 3. 178–89.

exemplifying factors in the game of evaluating the equivalence between benefactions and honors. Demosthenes points out that even before fifth-century figures such as Themistocles and Miltiades achieved their victories, they had received an important gift from the Athenians – the honor of being chosen as commanders – that had to be taken into account when estimating their rewards (23. 197). Nor was all the merit of the victories theirs, since it also belonged to the other Athenians who fought with them, a circumstance that tended to be forgotten in the case of commanders' victories in the fourth century (23. 198). The right of citizenship awarded to foreign benefactors was also more valuable in the fifth century than in the fourth because being an Athenian citizen was more esteemed in the past (23. 199–200). By contrast, Demosthenes indicates in *Against Leptines* that, although in the fifth century, Lysimachus son of Aristides received what might have seemed an impressive reward in land and money, Athens was in fact wealthy at the time. In the fourth century, however, a third of those goods would have been an enormous amount (20. 115).

The balance in the relationship between giver and receiver in euergetism was also characterized by fragility. This can be observed, above all else, in the exchange of benefactions and honors between poleis and Hellenistic kings. In the decree from Xanthus discussed earlier, the polis grants honors to the chief of the garrison, "so that all can see that the polis of the Xanthians is able to remember those who have done good to the polis . . . *and to respond with much larger favors to its benefactors*." A decree from Teos justifies the granting of honors to Antiochus III in similar terms: "so that we may be seen in every [circumstance] to be returning adequate thanks to the king and to the queen and *to be surpassing* (hypertithêmi) *ourselves in the honors paid to them in proportion to the benefactions received*."[92] These statements of the polis' open intent to surpass the other party in gifts, reminiscent of Cyrus' words in the *Cyropaedia* quoted earlier,[93] are more than a simple reflection of the agonistic spirit of the Greek polis – more, that is, than a mere indication that in some cases the polis tried to surpass (or liked to believe that it had surpassed) its benefactors in the competition of generosity. They suggest that the polis was sometimes unsatisfied with simply reestablishing equilibrium in its relationship with the benefactor, and that it took pains to swing the balance in its own favor by awarding "excessive" honors, which might eventually lead to a response in the form of new benefactions.

[92] Xanthus: Robert 1983: 126. Teos: Herrmann 1965a: 33–6 = Ma 2002: no. 17. [93] X. *Cyr*. 5. 3. 32.

As was noted in the case of expressions such as "worthy honors," statements such as those from Xanthus and Teos were sometimes pure rhetoric, but nonetheless rhetoric born of reality: the polis really did seek to obtain benefactions by granting excessive honors, and it sometimes succeeded in attaining its objective, as various inscriptions and literary sources confirm. In 160/159 BC, for example, Delphi, taking advantage of its Panhellenic prestige, asked Eumenes II, a patron of Greek culture, to put up cash for the wheat fund and the decoration of a sanctuary.[94] Eumenes promised to fulfill all that had been requested but made a donation only for the wheat fund; Delphi responded by granting him honors and sending a new embassy to ask that he fulfill the rest of his promise. Subsequently, Eumenes granted the remaining sum and supplied cash to create a foundation to finance the festival Delphi had instituted in his honor. Delphi responded with further honors.

How should we interpret this "dialogue," or better put, "negotiation"? Eumenes did not fulfill his promise only because Delphi had shown that it was prepared to fulfill its obligation of rewarding a benefactor. Nor did he act out of a simple desire to amass honors. Although he may have had political reasons (both domestic and foreign) for not wanting to disappoint, he acted as he did partly because Delphi voted to award him great honors – honors that amounted to gifts as well as counter-gifts, and that obliged him to reciprocate. He could not be forced to make a gift, but it was the right thing to do if he did not wish to violate the rules of gift-exchange. Eumenes followed a similar course of action with respect to Miletus. Through the Milesian Eirenas, who was on good terms with Eumenes' court, Miletus secured the king's promise to finance the construction of a new gymnasium. The city responded to the royal pledge by introducing a cult and a festival in Eumenes' honor and sent Eirenas to the court with the honorific decree. Eumenes then promised to increase his assistance and thus assume the costs of the honors he had been granted. It is evident that these honors, which are qualified as "appropriate," were so only if we consider the benefaction yet to come. Their function was double: to reward the king's goodwill but above all to ensure that the benefaction would materialize.[95]

[94] Bringmann and von Steuben 1995: no. 93 [E 1] and *Syll.*[3] 671 B = Bringmann and von Steuben 1995: no. 93 [E 2].

[95] Herrmann 1965b: 73–4 = Bringmann and von Steuben 1995: no. 284 [E 1]. As to whether Eumenes II received cultic honors before or after fulfilling his promise, Bringmann and von Steuben 1995: no. 284 [E 2] make it clear that it was before. On the details of these honors, see Bringmann and von Steuben 1995: no. 286 [E]. On the documents, see in general Bringmann 2000: 161.

The fragility of the balance in the benefactor/beneficiary relationship also yielded chains of gifts and counter-gifts. Many factors contributed to this delicate interplay. Sometimes the recipient, such as Eumenes II, reciprocated with deliberately greater counter-gifts, or perhaps he perceived the counter-gifts as such without this being the anticipated effect of the original gift. On other occasions, the benefactor, despite not feeling indebted on account of the received honors, took the opportunity as recipient of a counter-gift to reciprocate with the intention of obtaining new honors, because he was interested either in the honors themselves or in the relationship that derived from the exchange. An illustrative set of inscriptions from Cyme preserve the following sequence of events: (a) a woman named Archippe financed a new *bouleutêrion*; (b) the polis, as was proper, rewarded her with a golden crown, a statue that represented the demos crowning her, and an inscription of the decree in her honor; (c) Archippe reciprocated with a banquet for all Cyme; (d) the polis responded to this further gesture with praise and an honorific decree; (e) when the statue was erected, Archippe again offered her fellow citizens a banquet; (f) Cyme thanked her again with more praise and a new honorific decree; and (g) when Archippe fell sick immediately after the festivities and then recovered, the polis made sacrifices to thank the gods for her recovery, this being evidently a further reward for her benefactions.[96]

The vocabulary of gift-exchange

The correlation between gift-exchange and euergetism is apparent not only in the basic mechanisms of both institutions, in what we might call their structure, but also in vocabulary. Literary texts and, less often, inscriptions designate honors and benefactions as "gifts" (*dôreai*), which are what Phaedrus of Sphettus, for example, requested from the Athenians.[97] Especially illustrative are sources that mention both benefactions and honors as *dôreai*, and that openly present euergetism as an exchange of such. A passage from Demosthenes' *Against Leptines* illustrates the point: "For surely no one dreams that he [i.e., Leucon, the king of Bosphorus] will tolerate the cancelling of your gifts (*dôreai*) to him, and let his own gifts to

[96] *I. Kyme* 13. On the order of the decrees, see the commentary by Engelmann 1976: 28. See also Savalli 1993: 229–73; van Bremen 1996: 13–19.

[97] *IG* II^2 682 = *Syll.*^{3} 409. Bertrand 1992: 181 ("honneurs"). Gauthier 1985: 78 ("récompense"). Other examples of *dôreai* for honors: X. *HG* 2. 3. 8; Lys. 21. 11; fr. 7 (*Against Hippotherses*), 171–5 (Carey); Aeschin. 3. 236; D.S. 11. 27. 3; 20. 100. 1; Plu. *Mor.* 850b–1f; *IG* II^3 298 = *Syll.*^{3} 206. *Dôreai* for benefactions: Isoc. 18. 66; D. 20. 35; *IG* II^3 298 = *Syll.*^{3} 206; *OGIS* 748. Inscriptions refer less frequently to benefactions and rewards as *dôreai* because they tend to describe accomplishments and honors explicitly rather than in generic terms.

you stand good."[98] The same notion can be found in inscriptions. The Athenian decree in honor of Leucon's sons, for example, reads: "since [Spartocus and Paerisades] give the Athenians the same *dôreai* Satyrus and Leucon had given them [the Athenians], Spartocus and Paerisades shall receive the *dôreai* the people had awarded to Satyrus and Leucon."[99] Nor does the use of a single word – *dôrea* – to refer to benefactions and rewards reflect a lack of range in Greek vocabulary. As in the Homeric poems, where *dôrea* designates very different objects (payments for services rendered, fees, rewards, prizes, bribes, taxes, loans), so in the world of euergetism, the use of the word reflected the activity to which it was related: gift-exchange.[100]

Thus considerable evidence exists for a structural link between euergetism and gift-exchange. As I argue in detail in the chapters that follow, the first benefactors to be honored with titles, distinctions, and privileges were foreigners. The practice began in archaic times, and euergetic decrees were already being issued by poleis by the end of the sixth century at the latest;[101] the custom of honoring citizens as benefactors in a comparable fashion, on the other hand, did not catch on until the late fifth century.[102] All this makes it possible to envisage the first steps in the practice of bestowing such honors. Since the exchange of *dôreai* was a key feature in the relationship between individuals of different communities linked by *xenia*,[103] from the moment the citizens of a polis felt obliged to reciprocate to foreigners who had rendered services to their community as a whole, they responded by means of *dôreai* comparable to those of *xenia*. The honors awarded benefactors were thus nothing less than an adaptation, at the polis level, of the *dôreai* of gift-exchange between *xenoi*. Gabriel Herman explains this concept succinctly, although rather than speaking of benefactors he refers to *proxenoi* (who were, as we will see, a type of benefactor):

> For what are the privileges conceived of as gifts (*dôreai*) given by a city to a *proxenos* [and in general to all benefactors], if not a communal version of private gift-exchange? What is the meaning of the underlying sequence of the key concepts (present explicitly or implicitly in hundreds of decrees) – that *euergesia* engenders

[98] D. 20. 35. Leucon's *dôreai* were supplies of corn to Athens, while the *dôreai* of the Athenians were *politeia*, a golden crown and exemption from liturgies and custom duties at the Piraeus.
[99] *IG* II^3 298 = *Syll.*^{3} 206. [100] Finley 1978: 66.
[101] Sixth century: Hdt. 1. 54 (the honors of Delphi to Croesus); *Syll.*^{3} 4 = *Nomima* I 32. First half of the fifth century: *I. Cret.* IV 64 = *Nomima* I 8; *IG* XII Suppl. 549 = *Nomima* I 39; Hdt. 8. 136.
[102] Whitehead 1983: 67–8; Gauthier 1985: 95–7; Domingo Gygax 2006a: 290–4. Citizens victorious in Panhellenic games received awards from the archaic age onward, but this was exceptional and did not lead to civic euergetism. See Domingo Gygax 2006a: 274–8.
[103] Herman 1987: 7: "gift exchange with an outsider [is] the essential characteristic of guest-friendship."

a wish to confer a *charis* equivalent to the *euergetêma* – if not that the private etiquette of reciprocity had been transferred to the communal level?[104]

3 Proleptic honors

Let us return to our initial question: How is it possible that at Hippucome and other Greek poleis, significant honors were granted to individuals who had only promised contributions to public projects and had not yet accomplished them? Put another way: How can we explain the paradox of public subscriptions? An initial answer is that euergetism was a form of gift-exchange, and that in this typically Greek practice it was normal to outdo oneself, whether or not intentionally, in the counter-gift, to the extent of indebting the initial giver and forcing him to reciprocate with a new gift. Inscriptions from Xanthus, Teos, Delphi, and Miletus show that this characteristic phenomenon of gift-exchange also occurred in the exchange of benefactions and honors. To be more precise, the inscriptions reflect the desire of individual poleis to surpass their benefactors in gifts, thereby inspiring new gifts.[105] These being the "rules of the game" in euergetic exchange, the best way for a polis to ensure that individuals fulfilled promises made in the course of a public subscription was to grant them honors they did not yet deserve.

In this final portion of this chapter, I study in more detail the phenomenon of honors awarded with the intention of provoking benefactions. I refer to these as *proleptic honors*, with "prolepsis" implying "the assumption that a future event or condition has been realized," for the following reasons. The honors awarded to provoke benefactions were, to a considerable extent, designed to surpass in due proportion the debt aroused by the gift (e.g., a promise or a show of goodwill) that required repayment. In their capacity as honors (rewards), however, they did not appear as gifts but as counter-gifts, since a reward is by definition a counter-gift. At the same time, because of the reciprocity mechanisms of euergetism, which led to expectations that honors would lead to benefactions, these honors were to a substantial degree experienced as recompense for benefactions yet to come, as counter-gifts in advance or proleptic honors.

[104] Herman 1987: 135–6. In relation to the *proxenos* as benefactor: "above all he [the *proxenos*] was an *euergetês*, a benefactor."

[105] Xanthus: Robert 1983: 126. Teos: Herrmann 1965a: 33–6 = Ma 2002: no. 17. Delphi: Bringmann and von Steuben 1995: no. 93 [E 1] and *Syll.*³ 671 B = Bringmann and von Steuben 1995: no. 93 [E 2]. Miletus: Herrmann 1965b: 73–4 = Bringmann and von Steuben 1995: no. 284 [E 1].

In principle, once a benefaction (such as the payment of promised money) was carried out, the benefactor received no additional honors unless he also surpassed the polis in its counter-gift, or unless the polis was interested in continuing the chain of gifts and counter-gifts.

Proleptic honors deserve careful consideration for several reasons. First, they represent an opportunity to see that there were honors even more proleptic than those awarded in public subscriptions, honors based on no previous benefaction – not even a promise – which merely rewarded the benefaction they were designed to provoke. In addition, as is also the case with public subscriptions, the power of proleptic honors to oblige the recipient to perform a benefaction was sometimes based on more than the ability to indebt him. By publicizing and eventually recording (when an inscription was involved) a promise, such honors could put the recipient under pressure from fellow-citizens, or make him liable to formal and informal sanctions for default. In other cases, they could compel him by reminding him of a status – that of benefactor – that was part of his identity as king or *proxenos*, or by simply invoking his previous benefactions or the benefactions of his ancestors.

Such an analysis also allows us to see that proleptic honors were not exceptional, and to recognize the extent to which euergetism was saturated with prolepsis: it appears in all periods in the granting of honors to all types of benefactors and not only, as in the examples cited in the previous sections, to contributors to public subscriptions and kings. Finally, we can now address the question of how individuals who had merely promised benefactions could be rewarded and, in general, of how the existence of honors awarded in advance could be explained. Were this not the case, proleptic honors might appear to be a perversion of euergetism, and the practice of awarding them might be thought to have been sustained merely through a substantial dose of cynicism on the part of both the polis and the benefactor. Such analysis allows us to better understand some aspects of euergetism noted in the preceding sections, as well as others to be considered later. One interesting aspect of proleptic honors is precisely that they display in a radical fashion features and tendencies of euergetism that in other manifestations of the phenomenon are difficult to recognize.

3.1 Playing with the rules of euergetism

I begin with a case in which the granting of honors is clearly only the first step, and the honors pure gifts. Between 278 BC and 246 BC, Erythrae elected to bestow honors on King Antiochus (I or II), to which he replied

with a letter later inscribed in Erythrae. Although the decree is badly preserved, much of what took place between Erythrae and the king can be reconstructed. The city took the initiative to bestow honors on Antiochus and sent him an embassy with the honorific decree, a crown, gold, and a request to keep the polis autonomous and exempt from tribute. The king conferred these privileges and announced a willingness to grant more benefits in the future.[106]

There are other examples of this type of interaction between poleis and Hellenistic kings. The League of the Ionians, for example, established a festival in honor of Antiochus I and sent him an embassy with the decree and a request to guarantee the freedom and democracy of the league's poleis. Likewise, Xanthus honored Ptolemy III and his wife Berenice with crowns, statues, and sacrifices in Alexandria, and the king's reaction suggests that these honors came hand in hand with petitions. So too Miletus sent an embassy to Seleucus II with a crown, and although Seleucus' answer does not mention this, the fact that his letter was inscribed suggests that the polis accompanied the honors with a petition that was granted.[107]

In situations such as these, when a polis addresses a king through its envoys, as well as in the case of honorary decrees intended to be read to a king, the polis usually refers in a general way to the fact that the king (and sometimes his predecessors as well) has acted as its benefactor. In his letter to Xanthus, Ptolemy III acknowledges this convention: "we congratulate you for never failing to maintain the same feelings and for remembering with recognition the benefactions you have received from me, my father and my grandfather."[108] The claim that the honors were rewards for benefactions was a pretext for maintaining the fiction. This presented no difficulty when the polis bestowed honors on a king or dynasty to which it had been subject for a long time and which it had rewarded for benefactions in the past.[109] But why was such misrepresentation necessary? Aside from the fact that this was an uncomplicated way to justify the decision to honor the king, in an exchange of gifts the party that does not initiate the exchange occupies a subordinate position,[110] and a polis seeking favors

[106] Decree: *I. Erythrai* 30. Letter: *I. Erythrai* 31 = *OGIS* 223 = *RC* 15. Cf. Billows 1995: 76–7.

[107] League of the Ionians: *OGIS* 222 = *I. Erythrai* 504. Xanthus: Bousquet 1986: 22–4 (*SEG* XXXVI 1218). Miletus: *OGIS* 227 = *RC* 22. Cf. Billows 1995: 77.

[108] Bousquet 1986: 22–4 (*SEG* XXXVI 1218).

[109] See Schubart 1937: 21; Ma 2002: 190.

[110] Godelier 1999: 12: "The one who receives the gift and accepts it places himself in the debt of the one who has given it, thereby becoming indebted to the giver and to a certain extent becoming his 'dependant,' at least for as long as he has not 'given back' what he was given."

from a king would not want to put him openly in such a situation; the king, not the polis, was supposed to be the benefactor. Moreover, a gift that openly sought to elicit a specific counter-gift (the subject of the petitions specified in the polis' letter) – that is, a gift that was visibly self-interested – would have looked less generous than a reward for benefactions, even if these were only imaginary benefactions. Put another way, the official counter-gift (the honors for the king) was, ironically, more of a gift than an official gift would have been, and it was therefore more effective in obtaining a positive response.

The "gift" (as opposed to "counter-gift") function of honors is particularly apparent in a story preserved by Diodorus Siculus. We lack the polis decree that most likely contained the rhetorical reference to the king as benefactor. But the events that led to the bestowal of honors leave no doubt as to their real nature. In 305 BC, during the course of the war between Antigonus Monophthalmus and Ptolemy I, Antigonus threatened to besiege Rhodes, a state allied to Ptolemy, if it did not change sides. Rhodes responded by electing to bestow great honors on Antigonus. The benefaction it sought in exchange, according to Diodorus, was that the king respect Rhodes' treaties with Ptolemy. Although Antigonus did not do this, it is remarkable that the Rhodians hoped to achieve their objectives by awarding honors to Antigonus before he had rendered them any services – a not entirely unfounded hope, as the examples discussed earlier make clear.[111]

3.2 The scope of proleptic honors

Up to this point, I have discussed only cases in which the recipients of proleptic honors were Hellenistic kings. One might argue that in reality the awarding of such honors was a ploy intended to politely remind kings, who were by definition *euergetai*, of their obligation to act as such. Hellenistic kings endeavored to legitimize their supremacy by presenting themselves as benefactors, and they usually took pains to maintain this image unaltered. The honors accompanying requests from poleis increased pressure on kings to respond positively, inasmuch as they underlined the stereotype of the king as benefactor.[112]

It is accordingly important to note that despite the role all these factors played in the granting of advance honors to Hellenistic kings, in several cases the recipients were individuals of other sorts and in earlier periods.

[111] D.S. 20. 82. 2–3; cf. Billows 1995: 76.
[112] This aspect has been examined by Billows 1995: 73–80; Ma 2002: 204–5.

The principles of reciprocity of gift-exchange, not the manipulation of royal propaganda, thus lay at the root of the phenomenon of honors awarded in advance to Hellenistic kings. Such honors were nothing other than the continuation of a significant tradition of indebting benefactors with counter-gifts in advance, that is, with proleptic honors. I now turn to some examples of the variety of ways in which this type of honor was manifested, beyond those granted Hellenistic kings.

Diocleidas, a representative of a certain king Antigonus (Antigonus Gonatas or Antigonus Doson), received honors from Minoa in Amorgos in a decree that justifies the award as follows: "he promises (*epangelletai*) that in the future he will do all the good he can, both in words and acts." As Gauthier remarked, it is clear "that in the time the decree was voted, Diocleidas had not yet, properly speaking, rendered any service to the citizens of Minoa." The reality is that Minoa regarded Diocleidas as someone who enjoyed the king's confidence, and it hoped to gain some benefit in return for granting him honors.[113] In 299 BC, Nicagoras, an envoy of Demetrius Poliorcetes and Seleucus, received honors from Ephesus for similar reasons,[114] as did two *oikonomoi* of Lycia, who in 288/7 BC or 249 BC were nominated *euergetai* and *proxenoi* and awarded honors such as *politeia, enktêsis*, and *ateleia* by Limyra.[115]

That poleis competed for the favors of influential individuals with proleptic honors is clear from a letter by a governor of Antiochus I to Ilium, which also indicates that potential benefactors occasionally negotiated the honors they wanted:

> Meleager to the council and people of Ilium, greetings. Aristodicides of Assos has handed to us letters from King Antiochus, copies of which we append below. He also came to us in person and said that although *many others were approaching him and offering him crowns* – and we ourselves have information on this point, as embassies have come to us from certain poleis – he wished that the land given to him by King Antiochus should, because of the

[113] *IG* XII, 7, 221 b; Gauthier 1985: 142 (my translation; original text in French). Besides promising to benefit Minoa, Diocleidas brought letters from the king and encouraged the demos to eliminate the unrest. These were certainly "services" (Mack 2015: 60 n. 133), but as Gauthier indicates, Diocleidas was honored primarily for being a "possible protector." This case is one of the two examples Gauthier chooses to illustrate that "the absence or mediocrity of services rendered thus is in no way an obstacle to the nomination of a *proxenos.*" In fact, Diocleidas received more than *proxenia*: he was awarded a crown, the *euergetês* title, the right to attend the assembly and the council, and exemption from taxes. See also Paschidis 2008: 417 n. 1: "The honorand himself had not made major benefactions"; his honoring would "reflect the future expectations of the Minoans from him." On the date – very controversial – cf. Robu 2014: 103.

[114] *OGIS* 10 = *I. Ephesos* 5, 1453.

[115] Wörrle 1977: 44 (*SEG* XXVII 929). On the date, cf. Domingo Gygax 2001: 21; Meadows 2006.

sanctuary and because of this goodwill towards you, be attached to your polis. *What he wishes to be granted to him by the city, he will explain to you himself*. You would do well, therefore, to vote him all the privileges (*philanthrôpa*), to inscribe the terms of the grant he will make to you and exhibit them on a stele to be placed in the sanctuary, so that you may securely preserve for all time the grant that has been made to you. Farewell.[116]

As the rivalry among poleis indicates, the incorporation of Aristodicides' land was seen as highly beneficial,[117] and the best way to obtain the benefit was to vote honors that matched Aristodicides' desires. The text implies that these honors would need to be voted before the land was incorporated – that they were, in fact, a precondition. But formally they would be awarded as rewards for benefactions, namely Aristodicides' decision to choose Ilium and his "goodwill towards the polis" highlighted by the governor.

It is also important to note that the strategy of granting proleptic honors to foreigners was employed by poleis prior to the Hellenistic age. In 347/6 BC, for example, Athens passed a decree in honor of Spartocus and Paerisades, the sons of Leucon, the king of Bosphorus, because they said they were willing to provide the demos with grain and any other services the demos might request:

The Athenian demos praises Spartocus and Paerisades because they are good men and promise (*epangellontai*) to look after the export of grain, as their father did, and to perform enthusiastically whatever service the demos may require; and the envoys shall report to them that if they do these things, there is nothing they will fail to obtain from the Athenian demos.

Since they give the Athenians the same *dôreai* Satyrus and Leucon had given them [the Athenians], Spartocus and Paerisades shall receive the *dôreai* the demos had awarded to Satyrus and Leucon; and each of them shall be crowned with a gold crown at every Great Panathenaea.

. . . The secretary of the council shall inscribe this decree on a stone stele and stand it near the one for Satyrus and Leucon.[118]

The honors were not a reward for the promise but an attempt to encourage the potential benefactors to keep it. Athens was counting on both the debt created by the honors in advance and the fact that these honors put Spartocus and Paerisades under an obligation by evoking their father's

[116] *OGIS* 221 = *RC* 10–13 = *I. Ilion* 33 (Austin 2006: no. 164). [117] See Welles 1934: 70.
[118] *IG* II^3 298 = *Syll.*^{3} 206; tr. based on Lambert, *AIO*; Harding 1985: 106–7 (no. 82); Rhodes and Osborne 2003: 319–21 (no. 64).

benefactions. As noted earlier, the same strategy was applied by some Hellenistic poleis in their relationships with kings.

I do not agree with the suggestion that the only honors directly granted by the decree were the commendation and the stone stele, with the bestowal of the remaining honors conditional on the fulfillment of the promises.[119] The sentence "the envoys shall report to them [to Spartocus and Paerisades] that if they do these things, there is nothing they will fail to obtain from the Athenian demos" is intended to encourage the honorands to meet their commitment, as well as to send the typical message that any future benefaction will be rewarded (Spartocus and Paerisades have offered to "perform enthusiastically whatever service the people may require"). But it does not introduce any prerequisite for the conferral of citizenship, *ateleia*, and the crowns. The *epeidê* phrase with indicative (lines 20–3) that follows is not conditional, and it is formulated as if the benefaction had already been made or was on the way: "since [Spartocus and Paerisades] give the Athenians the same *dôreai* Satyrus and Leucon had given them [the Athenians], Spartocus and Paerisades shall receive the *dôreai* the people had awarded to Satyrus and Leucon."[120] A virtual benefaction is precisely one of the two main characteristics of proleptic honors. The other is the honor in advance: it is more efficient (and diplomatic) to award the honor ahead of time than to make it conditional on fulfillment of the promise.

Finally, there was one honor that, from ancient times, Greek poleis frequently granted with no prior benefaction and with the clear intention of obtaining something in exchange: the title *proxenos*, the precise meaning of which, however, requires discussion. The view – widespread among scholars – that in archaic and classical times the title *proxenos* designated an appointment that resembled an honorary consul, but that by the Hellenistic period it had "degenerated" into a simple honor,[121] probably requires revision.[122] As Gauthier makes clear, the title brought with it no clearly setout obligations. Instead, a politician who received it generally tried to use his influence in favor of the interests of the polis that had

[119] Cf. Deene 2012.

[120] See the translations in Harding 1985: no. 82; Rhodes and Osborne 2003: 318–21 (no. 64); and Lambert, *AIO* (cf. Engen 2010: 247–8; Deene 2012: 173).

[121] Recently Welwei 2001: 476. Marek 1984: 1–3, cites many other examples.

[122] The same can be said about its most sophisticated variant, in which *proxenia* was simultaneously an office or function ("Amt," "Aufgabe") and an honor ("Ehre"), with the emphasis on the former in the earlier period, and on the latter later on (Gschnitzer 1973: cols. 643–5.). Gauthier 1985: 134–6, convincingly argues that both theories should be rejected. See also Marek 1984: 388–91; Mack 2015: 4–8.

nominated him, whereas the activity of a doctor distinguished as *proxenos* primarily involved offering medical assistance to individuals from the nominating polis who visited his polis.[123] In contrast to what we might expect in the case of a position similar to a consulate today, moreover, poleis sometimes awarded the title *proxenos* to more than one person in the same polis.[124]

The title *proxenos* thus implies above all else an honor – like the title *euergetês* – generally accompanied by privileges such as a commitment by the state that granted it to protect the *proxenos* and his family from violence.[125] The polis granted the title to a foreigner as a reward for having rendered services to its citizens in the polis or, more often, in his home polis. We can assume that in principle this was a reward devised for benefactions to individual citizens abroad, while the title of *euergetês* was reserved for someone who had benefited the polis as a whole in a more direct fashion (although over the course of time, the distinction between the two was increasingly blurred). The origin of the institution may be related to the custom of offering hospitality to foreigners in an act of ritualized friendship (*xenia*), a practice that, with the rise of the polis, must have come to be perceived as a service to the polis and not just the individuals involved.[126] As a consequence, the person who performed the service – particularly if he did this frequently and for the benefit of several individuals from the same polis – came to be regarded as a benefactor of the polis as a whole.

For the purposes of my argument, it is crucial to recognize that granting the title *proxenos* appears to have had the character of a reward from the very first. Around 480 BC, Athens awarded the title to Alexander I of Macedonia along with the title *euergetês*, which implies that Alexander was recognized for being the city's benefactor.[127] The same can be said in the case of a certain Aristoteles, son of Chelonius, to whom an early fifth-century Eretrian decree granted the titles *proxenos* and *euergetês*.[128] In this light, it is worth noting the conclusions drawn by Michael Walbank in his work on fifth-century Athenian proxenies: "throughout the period of

[123] Marek 1984: 333–5, 390; Gauthier 1985: 142–3; Mack 2015: 48–76.
[124] Cf. Th. 3. 2. 3, 70. 1; Ar. *Av.* 1021; E. *Andr.* 1103; *Ion* 551, 1039.
[125] This is not a new idea (see M. Meier 1843: 6; von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1887: 239; Schubert 1881: 4–6; Busolt 1920–1926: 1246) and has been confirmed by Gauthier 1985: esp. 141–3. On the privileges, see Gschnitzer 1973: 710–12; Marek 1984: 151–3; Mack 2015: 122–30.
[126] Herman 1987: 130–3.
[127] Hdt. 8. 136, 143. It seems that his benefaction consisted in facilitating the supply of wood: Wallace 1970: 200; Gauthier 1985: 155, no. 59.
[128] *IG* XII Suppl. 549 = *Nomima* I 39, lines 10–13.

Athens' independence, and well into Hellenistic times, the two titles, *proxenos* and *euergetês*, are usually applied to the same honorand, implying that the proxeny was not awarded unless it had been earned through *euergesia*."[129]

That the title *proxenos* was a reward for benefactors, however, does not mean that it could not be granted to individuals who had not yet rendered a service. As in the case of other euergetic honors, the title could be awarded in advance as a proleptic honor. Indeed, given the laconic ambiguity of many decrees, which confine their descriptions of the achievements of the individuals nominated *proxenoi* to statements such as "he has proved to be favorable to the polis," it seems likely that the title *proxenos* was often awarded proleptically.[130] From its inception, in fact, the title was probably employed in a way that led easily to proleptic use, being granted not just with the intention of rewarding but also in the hope of maintaining a relationship and prompting the benefactor to new benefactions. The recipient could be expected to act out of satisfaction at the polis' demonstration of gratitude, or because he expected more rewards for new benefactions, or simply because he was interested in maintaining the relationship.[131] Moreover, the title *proxenos*, like *euergetês* – and in contrast with privileges such as *enktêsis* and *ateleia*, and with honors such as crowns and statues – might easily prompt in the recipient the notion that he must now behave in a fashion worthy of the title on a permanent basis. Given all this, the step of awarding the title of *proxenos* to individuals who were merely potential benefactors must have been taken early on.[132] Technically speaking, these were not "appointments" but instances of proleptic honors.

3.3 The logic of proleptic honors

As outlined at the beginning of this chapter, the practice of awarding honors, be they proxeny titles or others, in advance had a clear objective:

[129] Walbank 1978: 4–5. On the title *proxenos* as reward, see also Busolt 1920–1926: 1246; Domingo Gygax 2009: 180–2; Mack 2015: 38–43.

[130] Cf. Marek 1984: 333–5; Domingo Gygax 2006c: 15–16.

[131] In the third century, the Delians awarded a crown and two statues to the Macedonian Admetus for his services as *proxenos* (*IG* XI, 4, 664–5, 1053).

[132] Some of the ideas behind this reconstruction of the origin and evolution of the title *proxenos* can be found in Monceaux 1886: 2–3, and especially Busolt 1920–1926: 1246–7. Herman 1987: 130–9, focuses on the link between ritualized friendship (*xenia*) and *proxenia* and presents *proxenia* as an adaptation of *xenia* among individuals to the relationship between communities and foreigners, seeing the obligations of a *proxenos* as a prolongation of the obligations of the *xenos*. Herman regards all this as the result of a pact, not as the result of an exchange of services and rewards.

to prompt a response in the form of a benefaction. The award was based on the elementary principle that gifts generate counter-gifts, so that if a benefaction generated a reward in the form of an honor, an honor that was not really a reward generated a benefaction. But to understand the custom of awarding proleptic honors, and above all else how natural it was to the ancient Greeks, some additional aspects of euergetism must be considered.

The Greeks perceived less difference between benefactions and rewards than we do today. Once again, it is essential to bear in mind the kinship between euergetism and gift-exchange. As I have suggested, euergetism was to a considerable extent an exchange of *dôreai*, and it was thus not a contradiction – however paradoxical it may seem to us – to initiate the exchange of benefactions and rewards with the rewards. The practice of reversing the apparently logical order of benefaction and reward was facilitated by other aspects of euergetism as well: benefactions and rewards were not only elements of the same "nature," but in an ideal euergetic exchange, they also had the same "value." Rewards were granted to reestablish a balance in the relationship with the benefactor, and in principle (and often in practice) they were considered equal to the benefactions. In addition, euergetic exchange was often not limited to acts of giving and counter-giving. Whether the reward aroused in the benefactor a sense of indebtedness or a wish for further honors or the benefactor was merely interested in continuing the relationship with the polis, benefactions could lead to chains of gifts and counter-gifts. And such chains helped blur the difference between benefactions and rewards, since the difference between gifts and counter-gifts could not easily be discerned in them, as in the relationships between poleis and Hellenistic kings, and the particularly illustrative case of Cyme.[133]

When it came to benefactions and rewards, moreover, the Greeks were accustomed from the very beginning of the polis to act on both institutional and non-institutional levels. To some extent, these corresponded, respectively, to an imaginary and a real level, since an image of the exchange of benefactions and rewards, which occasionally failed to correspond to the reality, developed on the institutional level. As noted earlier, in the archaic polis members of the elite rendered great services. Although the elite did not receive honors, many of these services were perceived as

[133] Bringmann and von Steuben 1995: no. 93 [E 1] and *Syll.*³ 671 B = Bringmann and von Steuben 1995: no. 93 [E 2]; Herrmann 1965b: 73–4 = Bringmann and von Steuben 1995: no. 284 [E 1]; *I. Kyme* 13.

benefactions.[134] Among the reasons the early polis did not honor its civic benefactors is that their services were sometimes regarded – by elite and demos alike – as compensation for their privileged situation or as gifts requesting subordination (the demos' counter-gift).[135]

Side by side with euergetic reciprocity between polis and foreigners, a relationship of informal reciprocity thus existed in the archaic polis, in which the exchanged elements (services to the polis, on the one hand, and acceptance of the political and economic status quo, on the other) were not formally recognized as benefactions and rewards, despite being perceived as such. In fifth-century Athens, this type of relationship can be observed even more clearly. As liturgists, politicians such as Cimon, Nicias, and Alcibiades made important contributions that were regarded as benefactions by the Athenians.[136] Since liturgies were, a priori, obligations of a good citizen, and because during most of the fifth century the demos was reluctant to recognize any economic dependence on civic benefactors,[137] the services of such benefactors did not receive honors. But they did arouse a sense of indebtedness, and the demos therefore gave unofficial rewards in the form of political support – precisely the reward individuals such as Cimon, Nicias, and Alcibiades were looking for.[138] During the Peloponnesian War, however, and particularly after the loss of the empire in the fourth century, the relationship between the polis and its wealthiest citizens changed. Their contributions became more relevant, and with the growth of the custom of rewarding generals with honors, major donors also benefited by being increasingly honored.[139] Non-institutional rewards nonetheless continued. In several fourth-century speeches, for example,

[134] The archaic polis recognized the notion of "*euergesia* to the polis," as literary and epigraphic sources show when they mention the award of honors to foreign *euergetai* (not later than the sixth century: Hdt. 1. 54; *IG* IX, 1², 882 = *Nomima* I 34; *Syll.*³ 4 = *Nomima* I 32; *Nomima* I 40). The polis was able to honor its fellow citizens for a very specific type of benefaction, the athletic victory (Xenoph. fr. 2 West²; Plu. *Sol.* 23. 3; 24. 3; Paus. 8. 40. 1), and there were even voices (e.g., Xenophanes, cited earlier) that favored honors to citizens for other services.

[135] Von Reden 1995: 80–2; Domingo Gygax 2003: 194.

[136] Cimon: [*Arist.*] *Ath.* 27. 3–4; Plu. *Cim.* 10. 3–5 (Gorgias). Nicias: Pl. *Grg.* 472a; Plu. *Nic.* 3–4. Alcibiades: Th. 6. 16. 3; Isoc. 16. 35; Plu. *Alc.* 16. 3.

[137] The famous anecdote in Plutarch about the demos rejecting Pericles' offer to finance the building program (*Per.* 14) is thought to reflect this attitude, something the so-called "springhouse decree" would confirm (*IG* I³ 49). See Davies 1971: 459; Nippel 1982: 29; Stadter 1989: 181–2; Podlecki 1998: 86–7.

[138] Cimon: [Arist] *Ath.* 27. 3–4; Plu. *Cim.* 10. 3–5 (Gorgias), 7; Ath. 12. 532f–3c (Theopompus). Nicias: Plu. *Nic.* 3–4. Alcibiades: Th. 6. 16. 1–3; Plu. *Alc.* 16.

[139] Isoc. 18. 61 provides an early attestation of this practice (see Domingo Gygax 2006b: 491). On the evolution of honors for civic benefactors in the fifth and fourth centuries, see Gauthier 1985: 79–81, 112–14; Domingo Gygax 2006a: 285–95.

the defendant asks to be acquitted on account of his financial contributions to the polis.[140]

The coexistence of formal and informal levels of reciprocity in the exchange of benefactions and rewards must have facilitated the emergence of the award of honors in advance. Just as some benefactions were not recognized officially, despite being real, benefactions whose reality was yet to materialize began to be presented as real, and the corresponding proactive award of honors for anticipated benefactions – proleptic honors – emerges as an institution. Whether a service was portrayed by the polis as a benefaction or a reward depended to a considerable extent on the circumstances. The following inscription from Smyrna (a decree on the annexation of Magnesia by Sipylus) illustrates the point:

> Resolved by the people, proposal of the generals: since previously at the time when King Seleucus (II) crossed into Seleucis, and many great dangers were threatening our polis and territory, the people preserved its goodwill and friendship towards him, and was not daunted at the enemies' invasion and gave no thought to the destruction of its property, but considered everything secondary to the maintenance of its policy of friendship and to defending the king's interests to the best of its ability, as it initially promised; and so *King Seleucus*, who shows piety toward the gods and affection toward his parents, *being generous and knowing how to repay* (apodidonai) *gratitude towards his benefactors, honoured our polis because of the goodwill* (eunoia) *and zeal* (philotimia) *displayed by the people towards his interests* and because of the establishment in our polis of the cult of his father Antiochus Theos (the God) and his father's mother Stratonice Thea (the Goddess), in which are offered to them great honours publicly by the people and in private by each of the citizens.[141]

As Smyrna was in a position of some power, it could afford to depict the polis/king relationship as a benefactor/beneficiary rapport in terms that were the reverse of those in many inscriptions examined earlier. If Smyrna had needed the king's help, the goodwill of the polis would not have been presented as a benefaction but as a response to royal services,[142] and the king's favors would have been represented not as rewards for the benefactions of the polis but as royal benefactions, which Smyrna would in return have honored and accompanied with requests. But the fact that Smyrna

[140] Lys. 30. 1: "There have been cases, gentlemen of the jury, of persons who, when brought to trial, have appeared to be guilty, but who, on showing forth their ancestor's virtues and their own benefactions (*euergesiai*), have obtained your pardon" (tr. Lamb). See also Lys. 25. 13.

[141] *OGIS* 229 = *I. Smyrna* 573 (Austin 2006: no. 174).

[142] As for instance in the letter of Ptolemy III to Xanthus (Bousquet 1986: 22–4 = *SEG* XXXVI 1218).

was able, exceptionally, to express itself freely does not mean that its version is more "real" on that account. Perhaps the city's merits were not as great as the inscription would have us believe, and the king's favors – including a guarantee of the autonomy and democracy of the polis and a declaration that it was sacred and inviolate – were discretely perceived not as a reward but as a gift to ensure support in a region of uncertain loyalty.[143] Such examples show how fluid the concepts of benefaction and reward were and how unproblematic it was to present proleptic honors as recompense. In the chapters that follow, I argue that in the early history of euergetism these two levels of reciprocity, the institutional and the non-institutional, evolved in parallel to converge in only one, the institutional, or (put another way) that non-institutional exchange was gradually integrated into the institution of euergetism.

[143] Moreover, the favors of the king may not have been a reward for Smyrna's loyalty during the military conflict at all, if Ihnken 1978: 53–4, is right to assume that the section on the honors ("and so King Seleucus. . .") is unrelated to the initial passage, so that the honors were actually awarded before the hostilities.

CHAPTER 2

Creating an institution

The previous chapter argued that euergetism was grounded in the principle, deeply rooted in Greek culture, that gifts obliged recipients to reciprocate. But this principle and the other basic mechanisms at work in euergetism are insufficient to fully explain the origins of the institution. An examination of relations between communities and their benefactors reveals that communities could also reciprocate with non-institutional counter-gifts. It is also apparent that during much of the history of euergetism, whether a community's preferred form of reciprocation was formal or informal depended on the benefactor, in particular whether he was a foreigner or a citizen. In the chapters that follow, I attempt to answer the following questions: When were benefactors first rewarded with euergetic honors – in other words, when was euergetism born? Why did rewards begin this way, given that non-institutional rewards were also possible? Why did the official character of the reward depend on the citizen or noncitizen status of the benefactor for so long? And what led to the incorporation of citizens into the institution of euergetism and to its generalization to the extent that it became a major characteristic of the Hellenistic polis?

1 The initial stages of euergetism

1.1 The first euergetai and euergetic honors

Literary and epigraphic sources indicate that euergetism can be traced back to the archaic period. An inscription from Cyzicus dating to sometime in the sixth century, for example, granted two typical euergetic rewards, exemption from taxes (*ateleia*) and the right to dine (*sitêsis*) in the prytaneion, to an individual named Manes, as well as to the sons of a certain Aesepus and his descendants. It also records that "the polis has given the stele to Manes, son of Medices," which is another characteristic reward of

euergetism.[1] The same or similar honors (perhaps including the title *proxenos*) were awarded in a decree from Metapontum dating to the sixth century. Only part of the inscription is preserved, but the words that can be read ("to him and his descendants") indicate that it concerned the granting of honors.[2] In Athens at the end of the sixth century, a certain Timomachus set up a funerary monument for the Naxian metic Anaxilas with an epitaph stating that "the Athenians (*Athenaioi*) honored (*tieskon*) him for his outstanding moderation (*sôphrosyne*) and valor (*aretê*)." As Keiji Baba notes, "one may be permitted to sense a democratic atmosphere" in this sentence. Baba may be right to suggest that this might be "the earliest instance of the Athenian state rendering honor to a resident foreigner by decree."[3]

Already at the beginning of the fifth century, we find inscriptions reminiscent of the typical honorific decrees of the classical and Hellenistic age in terms of the expressions and formulations used, as well as the honors and benefactions mentioned. An early fifth-century inscription, for example, reports that Gortyn gave "a present (*dôrea*) to Dionysius . . . [for his valor] in war and his benefactions (*euergesiai*), . . . the exemption from all taxes (*ateleia*) for him [and his descendants], a citizen's justice (*wastia dika*), a house in Aulon inside the fortress and a parcel outside." Apart from this, in Eretria, Aristoteles son of Chelonius was appointed "*proxenos* and *euergetês*" according to an inscription generally dated to the first quarter of the fifth century, while Herodotus refers to Alexander I as *proxenos* and *euergetês* of Athens, seemingly reflecting a decree issued between 496–493 BC and 486–483 BC.[4] Such "advanced" euergetic terminology and rhetoric allows the conclusion that a tradition of honorific decrees existed at this point, and that the practice was already relatively widespread in the sixth century.

[1] *Nomima* I 32. Ehrenberg 1937: 152, dates the inscription to the first half of the sixth century, whereas Mordtmann 1880: 94–5; Jeffery 1990[2]: 60, 367; Hölkeskamp 1999: 172; and Zelnick-Abramovitz 2013: 23–4 put it in the second half. Pleket 1964: no. 21; Gehrke 1993: 58; van Effenterre and Ruzé 1994 I: 138; and Rhodes and Lewis 1997: 415 simply assign it to the sixth century. Most authors agree that the document represents an honorific decree.

[2] *Nomima* I 40. First half of the sixth century: Guarducci 1967–1978: vol. 2, 2, 13. Second half: Manni Piraino 1968: 458; van Effenterre and Ruzé 1994 I: 160.

[3] *IG* I[3] 1357; Baba 1984: 3 (followed by Duplouy 2006: 141–2; see also Derderian 2001: 78). The monument is "clearly late archaic" (Papadopoulos and Smithson 2002: 189 n. 184), and the form of the letters points to the end of the sixth century; more chronological precision is impossible, so that, in principle, the inscription could date either before (Willemsen 1963: 144) or after the reforms of Cleisthenes (Baba 1984: 3 and Duplouy 2006: 142).

[4] *I. Cret*. IV 64 = *Nomima* I 8 (Gortyn); cf. Gagarin 2008: 124–5; *IG* XII Suppl. 549 = *Nomima* I 39 (Eretria); Hdt. 8. 136. 1 (Alexander I). Knoepfler 2001: 72–3 considers it more probable that the Eretrian inscription belongs to the third quarter of the fifth century; Walker 2004: 28–9, by contrast, places it in the late sixth. On the date of the grant of honors to Alexander I, see Wallace 1970: 199.

As for when Greek cities began to issue decrees in honor of their benefactors, the evidence available allows us to say only that such decrees were inscribed on stone by the sixth century at the latest. This moment was allegedly preceded by a period in which decrees were inscribed on wood, and by a time when the decision to award honors was simply proclaimed in the assembly without being transposed into a text for public exhibition. This sequence might take us back to the seventh century. But such conjectures are unnecessary if one accepts the argument advanced in the previous chapter that the title *proxenos* was from the beginning a reward for benefactors of the city actual or potential.

One of the first references to the title *proxenos* is the mention of Menecrates of Oianthea (Locris) as a "*proxenos* dear to the demos" in an inscription on a cenotaph on Corcyra that has been dated to between the end of the seventh century (because of the Corinthian-style pottery from 640 BC to 625 BC found in the tomb) and 550 BC (for historical reasons, especially the significant role the demos plays in the inscription).[5] Another ancient reference (from 600 BC to 550 BC) appears in an inscription from the stadium of Olympia that reads "Gorgus, Lacedaemonian, *proxenos* of the Eleans."[6] In addition to providing indirect evidence of rewards by means of the title *proxenos*, these inscriptions are themselves rewards for services rendered. The tomb is a present from the demos for benefactions that could no longer be rewarded in other ways (i.e., the advantages every *proxenos* enjoyed while visiting the polis he represented) as a result of Menecrates' death. Likewise, the stadium inscription is a "distinguished honor," which was probably granted in return for the support the *proxenos* lent the Eleans in Sparta or in a city of *perioikoi*.[7]

[5] *IG* IX, 1² 882 = *Nomima* I 34. In favor of a late seventh-century date: Jeffery 1990²: 232; Meiggs and Lewis 1988: 4–5; Gauthier 1972: 60 n. 137; Fornara 1983: 17; Welwei 2001: 476; Duplouy 2006: 135–7. In favor of a date close to 550 BC: Wallace 1970: 190–3; van Effenterre and Ruzé 1994 I: 146; Robinson 2011: 125. Van Effenterre and Ruzé claim, against the *communis opinio*, that Menecrates, whom the inscription does not call a *proxenos* "of Corcyra," was a "magistrate" from Oianthea in charge of travelers going to Delphi. But this hypothesis seems unnecessary: *SEG* XXVI 476 = *Nomima* I 38 also includes no mention of the community from which the individual is *proxenos*, although he was *proxenos* of the Eleans (cf. *Bull. ép*. 1977: 346). Moreover, *Nomima* I 37, which reports that the individual is *proxenos* of the Eleans, shows that even a single community could refer to a *proxenos* in two ways, by mentioning the community or omitting it. On the cenotaph and the inscription as rewards for benefactions, see Domingo Gygax 2006a: 275–6. Duplouy 2006: 135–7, considers "the monument a public honor awarded to a citizen of Oianthea by the city of Corcyra" (my translation; original text in French).

[6] *SEG* XI add. 1180 a = *Nomima* I 37. On the date, see van Effenterre and Ruzé 1994 I: 156. *SEG* XXVI 476 (sixth century) probably also refers to a *proxenos* of the Eleans.

[7] Van Effenterre and Ruzé 1994 I: 156.

The institution of euergetism was thus at work from at least the first half of the sixth century on, matching the level of the polis' institutional development at the time.[8] Literary sources, although full of fictitious elements, also prove that Greeks in the classical period perceived the custom of honoring foreign benefactors as an ancient one. According to Herodotus, in the mid-sixth century the Lydian king Croesus gave two gold staters to each inhabitant of Delphi: "The Delphians, in return, gave Croesus and all Lydians the right of first consulting the oracle (*promanteia*), freedom from all charges (*ateleia*), the chief seats at festivals (*proedria*) and the perpetual right of Delphian citizenship to anyone who wished." Another passage in Herodotus reports that the members of the Athenian deme of Decelea had enjoyed *ateleia* and *proedria* in Sparta since remote times, because they supported the sons of the Spartan king Tyndareus. Echoes of ancient privileges of *proedria* can also be found in Lycurgus, according to whom the descendants of Cleomantis of Delphi enjoyed this right in Athens because Cleomantis helped Athens in the time of King Codrus. In addition, Herodotus refers to old rewards in the form of land. The Elean diviner Callias was compensated with many plots in Croton for his services in the war of the Crotonians against Sybaris (*ca*. 510 BC). The Sybarites apparently maintained that Croton was helped as well by the Spartan prince Dorieus, but the Crotonians denied this by pointing to the lack of rewards for Dorieus. Had he helped them, "he would have received a reward many times greater (than Callias')"![9]

Resonances of benefactions being rewarded with land can be traced in the *Iliad*. Bellerophon was recompensed by the Lycians for having fought the Chimera, the Solymi, and the Amazons: "the Lycians meted out for him a demesne pre-eminent above all, a fair tract of orchard and of plough-land, to possess it."[10] When Meleager withdrew from the fighting in the war between the Aetolians and the Curetes, "the elders of the Aetolians . . . promised him a mighty gift (*mega dôron*)" consisting of "a fair tract of fifty acres, the half of it vineland, and the half clear plough-land." Achilles, wondering about Aeneas' motivations for approaching him, asks: "Have the Trojans meted out for thee a demesne pre-eminent above all, a fair tract

[8] See Gehrke 2009: 395–410, esp. 403; van Wees 2013: 5–10.

[9] On Croesus: Hdt. 1. 54. For archaeological evidence of Croesus' munificence, see Mellink 1992: 654. On the Tyndaridae: Hdt. 9. 73. On Cleomantis: Lycurg. 1. 86. On Callias, Hdt. 5. 44–5.

[10] See *Il*. 6. 192–5 (tr. Murray). This land is clearly a reward and not simply a consequence of the fact that Proteus offers Bellerophon his daughter and "half his kingly honor": cf. schol. *Il*. 6. 194 and Piñol Villanueva 2013: 117.

of orchard and of plough-land, that thou mayest possess it, if so be thou slayest me?" [11]

The land given to Bellerophon (and inherited by Sarpedon and Glaucus) is mentioned again in a later passage of the *Iliad* that seems to refer as well to rewards of honorific rather than material nature: "Glaucus [-asks Sarpedon-], wherefore is it that we twain are held in honor above all with seats, and messes, and full cups in Lycia, and all men gaze upon us as on gods?"[12] Other Homeric passages mention similar rewards given by the community or its armed people (the *laos*). For instance, Menelaus reminds the rulers of the Argives that they "drink public wine" (*dêmia pinousin*).[13] There is also a special category of reward: the "gift of honor" (*geras*), which normally consists of an extra portion of the booty given to the leader, theoretically for his services to the group. It may be awarded by the group or taken by the leader for himself, but technically it is always a gift by the group, since the leader acts as a representative of the collectivity.[14]

The reward (counter-gift) character of such gifts is sometimes clear. When Achilles sacked Tenedus, for example, the Achaians "chose out" a woman, Hecamede, for Nestor, because "in counsel he was ever best of all." In other cases, this reward aspect is less obvious. It is certainly recognizable that the gifts are part of an exchange of honors and services. In the former example, Sarpedon mentions the gifts he and Glaucus receive so as to remind Glaucus that these gifts compel the two of them to fight bravely: "Therefore now it behoveth us to take our stand amid the foremost Lycians, and confront the blazing battle." In the other instance cited earlier, Menelaus reminds the Argive rulers of the wine offered by the people for similar reasons, to force them to rescue the body of Patroclus.[15] But very often – particularly in the distribution of booty – there is a component of obligation that brings such gifts close to extractions. The leader automatically receives a bigger portion, regardless of his performance.

In fact, most gifts granted by Homeric communities to their leaders are either extractions (often called *dôtinai* or *themistes*) or gifts belonging to

[11] *Il.* 9. 574–9; 20. 184–6 (tr. Murray). On all these Homeric examples, see Piñol Villanueva 2013: 116–18. See also. Hes. fr. 37 M.–W. (but here the reward comes from the king Proetus, not the community).

[12] *Il.* 12. 310–12 (tr. Murray).

[13] *Il.* 17. 248–50. On the interpretation of this passage as a reward by the people and other examples, see Scheid-Tissinier 1994: 221–84, esp. 273, and van Wees 2013: 20.

[14] Donlan 1981/82: 158–9; Scheid-Tissinier 1994: 234–44, 251–3; Ulf 2009: 87; van Wees 2013: 20.

[15] Gift for Nestor: *Il.* 11. 625–7 (tr. Murray); Sarpedon and Glaucus: *Il.* 12. 316–17 (tr. Murray); leaders of the Argives: *Il.* 17. 248–50.

an ambiguous category with contradictions similar to those of the gifts known by anthropologists as *chiefly dues* (where willingness and obligation are combined).[16] Generosity toward one's followers and the community is a *conditio sine qua non* to maintain leadership as well as to achieve it (unless a man inherits a rank that gives access to it).[17] Gifts to the leader are accordingly not only compensation for the exercise of leadership – a service – but also recompense for donations. At the same time, the option of not giving to the leader who asks for gifts does not exist. The leader can force a gift, even if he is not entitled to it. Moreover, one function of gifts to the leader is to symbolize his power, which includes not only the capacity to indebt others but also the ability to impose his will. This aspect is strange to the fundamental mechanisms of gift-exchange, which are based on indebtedness and moral pressure but not coercion.[18]

1.2 *Athletes as benefactors*

In the examples previously discussed, one aspect in particular attracts attention: all benefactors in the archaic sources after Homer – or almost all – are foreigners. Manes' origin alone is obscure. But the fact that his polis is left unnamed does not necessarily mean that he was a citizen of Cyzicus. Archaic inscriptions often fail to indicate the *ethnikon*; in the cases of the foreigners Dionysius and Aristoteles referred to earlier, the polis is not mentioned.[19] Everything would thus seem to suggest that in the archaic polis, citizens did not receive honors or did so only extraordinarily – with one important exception, successful athletes in Panhellenic games.

Citizens who achieved success in sport were regarded as benefactors of their poleis. Victory in the Olympic, Pythian, Isthmian, or Nemean games was a great honor not only for the athlete but also for his homeland. Its name was solemnly proclaimed by the herald at the site of the competition along with the athlete's own after the triumph, and it appeared in votive

[16] On the extractions, see Scheid-Tissinier 1994: 224–9. On chiefly dues, Sahlins 1972: 134, 209, 242; Donlan 1981/2: 159–61.

[17] Donlan 1981/2: 168–72; Hall 2014: 127–33.

[18] In this respect, my interpretation differs from Donlan 1997: 22, who believes that gifts to the *basileis* were essentially based on reciprocity and were perceived simply as counter-gifts by Homeric communities. See, however, the examples discussed by Scheid-Tissinier 1994: 224–8 and van Wees 2013: 18, 19, 21, 23.

[19] *Nomima* I 32 (Manes); cf. Zelnick-Abramovitz 2013: 23, who regards Manes as a citizen. *I. Cret*. IV 64 = *Nomima* I 8 (Dionysius); *IG* XII Suppl. 549 = *Nomima* I 39 (Aristoteles).

inscriptions.[20] The works of two authors from the close of the archaic period, Bacchylides (*ca*. 520–450 BC) and Pindar (522 or 518–*ca*. 440 BC),[21] reflect how aggressively the polis greeted athletes' victories in Panhellenic games. And the chronology of the honors discussed in the following pages makes it clear that this attitude already existed much earlier than Bacchylides and Pindar.

Pindar's *epinikia* contain numerous references to the athlete/polis relationship and to the benefits the athlete's victory brought. Thanks to the athlete's triumph, the name of the polis was heralded abroad: Pindar sings that "by winning in the wrestling match," Alcimedon of Aegina "proclaimed long-oared Aegina as his fatherland," while Melissus from Thebes "had Thebes proclaimed by winning in the chariot race."[22] The polis gained prestige through the athlete's triumph. Telesicrates from Cyrene "by his victory made Cyrene glorious," while Aristoclidas of Aegina "has linked this island to glorious praise."[23] It is unsurprising, then, that the victory was presented as the athlete's gift (*dôrea*) to his polis. *Olympian* 5, for example, contains a reference to the "lofty deeds and crowns won at Olympia, gifts (*dôra*) of the tirelessly running mule cart and of Psaumis."[24]

The *epinikion* was commissioned by the athlete himself or by one of his relatives rather than by the polis (although there are cases in which the latter possibility cannot be dismissed).[25] Unlike honorific decrees, *epinikia* as a rule reflect not the polis' official attitude toward its benefactor, but how the athlete thought he was seen by others or, to be more exact, how he wished to be seen. We can nonetheless assume that his self-characterization as benefactor corresponded to the *semiofficial* attitude of the polis toward his victory, that is to say, to the attitude of those who ruled the polis (an oligarchy in most cases, or a tyrant). *Epinikia* were usually intended to be performed in the athlete's polis in front of the entire community or a select group from it, or in the place where the competition was held, in front of

[20] For the mention of the polis by the herald, see Gauthier 1985. For the inscriptions, see Moretti 1953; Ebert 1972.

[21] See Snodgrass 1980: 133; Carey 1996: 1184: Pindar "presents the world view of the aristocrat of the late archaic period."

[22] Pi. *O*. 8. 20; *I*. 3. 13. So too Psaumis from Camarina "proclaimed his father Acron and your newly founded home" (Pi. *O*. 5. 8).

[23] Pi. *P*. 9. 73–5; *N*. 3. 67–8. See also Pi. *O*. 5. 17–22: Zeus is requested to "embellish this city [Camarina] with famous feats of courage."

[24] Pi. *O*. 5. 1–4.

[25] Mann 2001: 42, 44; Aloni 2012: 24. On *epinikia* commissioned by the polis, see Currie 2004; Carey 2007; Currie 2011.

a Panhellenic public that included fellow citizens.[26] We can assume that *epinikia* did not contradict the attitude toward athletic victory espoused by those who controlled the polis. In Athens, where *epinikia* conflicted with the dominant ideology, there were none, or only in exceptional cases.[27] At least in the case of *epinikia* composed for communal celebrations, the image of the athlete as benefactor that was transmitted by the ode also had to correspond to the feelings of the majority of the community, since *epinikia* aspired to resonate with the audience and transform the performance into a festive participatory event.[28] There are many instances of *epinikia* that address themselves to the whole community or point to the involvement of "the demos" or "the *politai*."[29] This does not mean that the community's attitude toward the victory was unanimous, or that there were not sectors that regarded the athlete's success as no particular benefaction or were reluctant to recognize it as such publicly.[30] In *Pythian* 9, for example, Pindar warns that no citizen should prevent the athlete's contribution to the common good from being recognized: "Therefore, let no citizen, whether friendly or hostile, keep hidden a labour nobly born in behalf of all, thereby violating the command of the Old Man of the Sea [Nereus], who said to praise even one's enemy wholeheartedly and justly when he performs noble deeds." *Isthmian* 1 contains similar sentiments: "If someone is devoted wholeheartedly to excellence with both expenses and hard work, it is necessary to give those who achieve it a lordly vaunt with no begrudging thoughts."[31] But Pindar's words are in any case an effort to ensure maximum consensus within the community and pose no challenge to an interpretation of *epinikia* as evidence that the polis considered the victorious athlete a benefactor. Nor is this interpretation challenged by a reading of Pindar according to which the poet's characterization of the victory as a benefaction for the polis is part of a strategy to reintegrate the athlete into the community of citizens, from which he risks alienation resulting

[26] See Kurke 1991: 3; Mann 2001: 41; Hornblower 2004: 34–5; Neumann-Hartmann 2009: 61–132; Morrison 2012. Currie 2004: 63: "epinician poetry is *public* poetry."

[27] Only two of the forty-five extant Pindaric *epinikia* are devoted to Athenian athletes (*P.* 7 and *N.* 2), and none was composed to be performed in Athens. In the case of *P.* 7, the athlete, Megacles, was in exile. I comment on this question in Chapter 3.

[28] Saïd and Trédé-Boulmer 1984: "The moment . . .of the celebration of the epinikion . . . gathers the whole city around its victorious son for a communal festivity, a ceremony both religious and civic" (original text in French). See also Bouvrie 2004: 356; Currie 2004: 63; Neumann-Hartmann 2009: 125–32.

[29] See the examples cited by Currie 2004: 63 and Currie 2011: 273.

[30] Kurke 1991 has shown how heterogeneous the audience of the *epinikia* was in this sense.

[31] Pi. *P.* 9. 93–6; *I.* 1. 41–5.

from envy and the fear of tyranny his triumph inspires. (This strategy goes hand in hand with similar negotiations to reintegrate the athlete into his *oikos* and among other members of the elite.[32]) The poet's tactic could only hope to succeed if the community were predisposed to accept the image of the athlete/benefactor. Pindar could highlight this idea, but he could not invent it, and the emphasis could not be an act of criticism. The late archaic polis was not Athens in the classical period, and Pindar was not Aristophanes.

Honors for athletes

Athletes were rewarded in ways that fit the image of benefactors. Already in the archaic period, they obtained honors such as statues (erected by the polis or by the athlete himself with the consent of the polis), *sitêsis, proedria*, and cash rewards, apart from the homage rendered when they arrived at the city and during the performance of the *epinikion*. A poem by Xenophanes (570–478 BC) provides the best testimony for the honors athletes received. Paradoxically, Xenophanes is criticizing the granting of such honors, an attitude apparently not shared by the majority of his fellow citizens, or at least not by those who ran the polis:

> But if by swiftness of foot one were to gain a victory
> or in the pentathlon, there by Pisa's stream in Olympus in
> the sacred grove of Zeus,
> or again the painful art of boxing
> or the fearsome sport they call *pankration*,
> he would appear more glorious to his townsmen
> and win the front-row seat of honor at games.
> And there would be food from the city's public stores
> and a keepsake gift for him.
> And even if he were to win with horses he would get all these,
> not being as worthy of them as I.[33]

An Olympic victor, that is to say, was regarded by his fellow citizens as more glorious than other people, and he received the privileges of *proedria* and *sitêsis* as well as a gift (*dôrea*). The mention of a gift coincides with information preserved in an inscription from the territory of Sybaris engraved in early sixth-century letters on the bronze plate of a lost statue, which states:

[32] Kurke 1991. [33] Xenoph. fr. 2. 1–11 West² [tr. Lesher 1992: 13–15].

A gift. Cleombrotus son of Dexilaus, having won at Olympia and having promised a prize of equal length and width [?] to Athena, dedicated a tithe.[34]

The inscription indicates that Cleombrotus dedicated a statue to Athena and financed it with a tenth of the reward he received from his polis for his victory, a reward that must have been substantial, judging from the minimal portion of it spent to erect the statue.[35] Less reliable, but nonetheless probably featuring some authentic content in light of Xenophanes' testimony and the Sybaris inscription, is a report by Plutarch and Diogenes Laertius that Solon established rewards for Isthmian and Olympic victories at 100 and 500 drachmas, respectively.[36]

As for the victorious athlete's privilege of having a statue erected in the polis, we know that the agora of Phigalia contained a statue of Arrhachion, a three-time winner at Olympia between 572 BC and 564 BC. Pausanias' description indicates that this was a contemporary work of the *kouros* type: "It is archaic, especially in its posture. The feet are close together, and the arms hang down by the side as far as the hips. The statue is made of stone, and it is said that an inscription was written upon it. This has disappeared with time."[37] In the inscription of Cleombrotus quoted earlier, the expression "of equal length and width" applies to the relationship between the dimensions of the statue and those of the athlete himself,[38] which means that in the first half of the sixth century, Cleombrotus had himself represented at life size. As Catherine Keesling has pointed out, the assumption that the statue was a *kouros* type does not mean that (like Arrhachion's) it was not a portrait: "the goal of mimesis – the accurate reproduction of the

[34] Stoop and Pugliese Carratelli 1965: 17–21; Ebert 1972: 251–5; Dubois 2002: no. 5; trans. Miller 2012: no. 220. Bernardini 1977: 149–54 suggests a date between the end of seventh century and the beginning of the sixth. But cf. Moretti 1970: 295; Ebert 1972: 251; Dubois 2002: 23; Cuniberti 2011: 275–6.

[35] Some aspects of the text are difficult to understand, so that the translations by Ebert 1972: 251; Dubois 2002: 27; and Cuniberti 2011: 276 diverge somewhat from that quoted. But it is clear that Cleombrotus dedicated a tenth of his victory prize, and also that he is not referring to the prize he obtained in Olympia ("what is a tenth of a crown of olive leaves?" asks Miller 2012: 179). Ebert 1972: 251–5; Finley and Pleket 1976: 77; Kyle 1984: 97; Golden 1998: 76; Mann 2001: 72; Dubois 2002: 27; Miller 2004: 214; Cuniberti 2011: 276, all rightly assume that it was a tenth of the reward given by his polis.

[36] Plu. *Sol.* 23. 3; 24. 3; D.L. 1. 55. Many scholars take the report seriously, for example, Pleket 1974; 62–3; Buhmann 1975: 106; Finley and Pleket 1976: 77; D. Young 1984: 128–31; Kyle 1987: 22; Krumeich 1997: 201; Mann 2001: 70–2; van Wees 2013: 80. Although coins had not yet reached Athens in the time of Solon, monetary units were already in use (von Reden 2010: 21). I leave the question of whether Solon introduced cash rewards in Athens or reduced the amount of existing rewards, and whether he was a promoter of athletics or a detractor, for the end of this chapter.

[37] Paus. 8. 40. 1. Hyde 1921: 327–8 identifies an archaic torso found in the territory of Phigalia with the statue of Arrhachion, but the identification is rejected by Gross 1969–1971: 64 n. 3; Herrmann 1972: 115; Ridgway 1977: 47.

[38] Ebert 1972: 251–3; Mann 2001: 72; Keesling 2003: 168. Cf. Finley and Pleket 1976: 77.

appearance of the subject represented by a portrait statue – and the goal of commensurability between statue and subject predate by far the invention of portraits we would recognize as physiognomic."[39] The statue of Cylon seen by Pausanias on the Athenian acropolis, on the other hand, does not seem to correspond to the time of his triumph (640 BC) but is a work of the classical age.[40] The statue of the Olympic five-time winner Hetoemocles (late sixth century), located in the agora of his city, Sparta, may have been a similar case. In favor of this is the fact that in the fifth century, the Spartans honored Chionis, a seventh-century Olympic victor, with a statue at Olympia.[41]

In principle, the habit of erecting statues of victorious athletes in the polis might be as old as the first statues of athletes at Olympia. The problem is that the initial stages of this type of statue are unclear. Pausanias states that the first athletes to have statues at Olympia were Praxidamas and Rhexibius, winners in 544 BC and 536 BC, respectively, and that the statues were made of wood.[42] But he also mentions a statue of Eutelidas of Sparta, winner in 628 BC, which he says "is old, and the letters on the pedestal are worn dim with age."[43] Pausanias' judgment on the origin of the erection of statues in Olympia might be based simply on the material from which the statues of Praxidamas and Rhexibius were constructed, or he may have copied the information from a written source without considering his own observations. If wooden statues were erected in Olympia in the sixth century, moreover, in contrast to later times, the oldest ones may not have survived until Pausanias' day (second century AD). Scholars are accordingly divided about when statues of athletes were first erected at Olympia.[44] I suggest that what we know about statues *outside* Olympia helps fix the date when statues were first erected at the venues where games were held, rather than that what we know about Olympia should be allowed to determine when athletes were first rewarded with statues in the polis.[45]

[39] Keesling 2003: 168. See also Lattimore 1988: 255.

[40] Paus. 1. 28. 1; cf. Mann 2001: 67; Keesling 2003: 177. Some scholars, however, consider this a work from Cylon's time; cf. Rausa 1994: 79.

[41] Hetoemocles: Paus. 3. 13. 9. Chionis: Paus. 6. 13. 2 (see Moretti 1957: nos. 42–7; Rausa 1994: 101). Rausa 1994: 79, by contrast, regards the statue of Hetoemocles as from the end of the sixth century.

[42] Paus. 6. 18. 7. [43] Paus. 6. 15. 8.

[44] In favor of a seventh- or sixth-century date: Lippold 1923: 2265–73; Buhmann 1975: 59; Herrmann 1988: 120; Rausa 1994: 77–9; Decker 2001: col. 534; Neudecker 2001: col. 933; Smith 2007: 97. Unconvinced by the evidence: Lattimore 1988: 249.

[45] Curiously, Lattimore 1988: 254, who accepts that Arrhachion erected a statue in Phigalia, and Keesling 2003: 168, who admits the existence of a statue of Cleombrotus in the first half of the sixth century, seem reluctant to accept the possibility that statues of athletes were erected in Olympia before the mid-sixth century.

A statue was the highest honor an athlete could receive, but there were other rewards as well. To those already mentioned, one might add the reward in Sparta for Olympic victors of a special place in the battle line next to the king.[46] There is also evidence of less official rewards, such as a sequence of receptions, processions, and feasts. Pindar says of Telesicrates that Cyrene "will welcome him gladly to his country," while *Isthmian* 8 calls for a celebration in honor of Cleander of Aegina, a celebration to which the poet refers in a way that could not better express its character as a counter-gift: "a glorious requital for his efforts and a reward both for his Isthmian victory and because at Nemea he gained triumph in the contests."[47] The *epinikia* themselves are often proof of this kind of reward, since the feasts at which they were performed were frequently an homage to the athlete rendered by the community.[48]

Epinikia *as rewards*

Often the *epinikia* – the poetic compositions alone, not to mention the performance and the accumulation of homage that surrounded them – constituted a reward from the polis to the athlete as well.[49] This assertion requires separate commentary, given the claim (not incompatible with mine) that Pindar presents his *epinikia* as precisely the opposite, a gift by the athlete to the polis and an extension of his triumph, his benefaction to it.[50] If we take into account *proedria, sitêsis*, statues, receptions, and feasts of homage, including the gatherings at which *epinikia* were performed, it becomes difficult not to regard at least those *epinikia* performed in a public sphere as another piece in the system of rewards for athletes. Pindar's poetry confirms this impression. *Nemean* 3 presents the *epinikion* as the best possible reward for an athlete: "Different deeds thirst for different rewards, but victory in the games loves song most of all, the fittest

[46] Plu. *Mor*. 639e; *Lyc*. 22. 4–5.

[47] Pi. *P*. 9. 74 (Telesicrates); *I*. 8. 1–5. See also the mention of celebrations in Aegina after the victory of Phyteas in the pancration at Bacch. 13. 67 ff.

[48] See Bowra 1964: 161–3; Saïd and Trédé-Boulmer 1984: 163; Gelzer 1985: 96–7; Mann 2001: 41.

[49] The oldest known *epinikion* is a poem by Simonides from 520 BC (*PMG* 510), but a papyrus seems to contain fragments of three or four poems for victors composed by Ibycus (Campbell fr. 282 B; *SLG* 220–6), who was active in the middle of the sixth century. One of these poems might have been composed for Callias, an Athenian victorious at Olympia in 564 BC (Kyle 1987: 203); see Barron 1984; Golden 1998: 77; Hornblower 2004: 21–2, 248; Rawles 2012: 3–12.

[50] The interpretation is Kurke's 1991: esp. 90–1, 188–9, 193–4, 260, and belongs to her general thesis that Pindar attempts to reintegrate the athlete into the community. In favor of her thesis, see Kirkwood 1993: 87: "Both victory and song, Kurke argues, are aristocratic benefactions to the polis, forms of *megaloprepeia*. This, in my opinion, is the most valuable part of Kurke's study." Against: Carey 1994: 184. Cf. Heath and Lefkowitz 1991; Eckerman 2010.

companion for crowned achievements." Later on, the *epinikion* is described as an expression of the homeland's happiness: "Zeus, yours is the blood, and yours the contest, which this hymn has struck with young men's voices as it celebrates this land's joy. Loud acclaim is in order for victorious Aristoclidas." *Isthmian* 1 expresses a need to praise the individual who has obtained victory ("it is necessary to give those who achieve it a lordly vaunt") and insists that praise is the best reward ("he who wins luxurious glory in games or as a soldier by being praised gains the highest profit").[51] There are also other reasons for understanding *epinikia* as rewards offered by the polis: (a) it was the polis that permitted *epinikia* to be performed publicly, providing both an audience and a venue (this was different, of course, when *epinikia* were performed in a private setting); (b) the majority of *epinikia* intended for performance at the site of the games were probably composed with the cooperation of the athlete's polis, which also provided the choir; (c) sometimes *epinikia* even adopt a form in which the community openly praises the athlete.

I have already noted that the athlete or one of his relatives generally paid for the *epinikion*. But it was often also the athlete or a relative who paid for the statue that commemorated his victory in the city, a circumstance that did not prevent this from being regarded as a reward granted by the polis, which granted permission for the erection of such statues in public spaces. Like *epinikia*, statues were intended to immortalize the athlete's name and victory, and to ensure that the herald's proclamation would be engraved in bronze or stone forever.[52] Indeed, Pindar often compares his *epinikia* to statues and commemorative stelae.[53] In the ode to Deinias of Aegina, for example, the poet addresses himself to the deceased father of the athlete and exclaims: "For your homeland and the Chariadai, I can erect a loud-sounding stone of the Muses in honor of those twice famous pairs of feet (i.e., the two running victories)."[54]

As Kurke observes, Pindar also presents his *epinikia* as gifts of the athlete to the community.[55] But there is no contradiction in this, since the *epinikion* belonged to a category of rewards that both required a contribution by the honored person for its materialization and benefited the community. The money to finance the poem typically came from the athlete, who participated in the selection of its themes;[56] in the case of *epinikia* intended for representation in the polis, the result was a creative

[51] Pi. *N.* 3. 6–8, 65–7; *I.* 1. 43, 50–1. On the latter passage, see Thummer 1968: 146.
[52] Steiner 1993: 178; Steiner 1994: 95, 99. [53] Steiner 1993: 159–80; Steiner 1994: 91–9.
[54] Pi. *N.* 8. 46–8. [55] Kurke 1991, esp. 90–1, 188–9, 193–4, 260. [56] Mann 2001: 44.

effort from which the entire community benefited. Statues paid for by athletes belonged to the same category. Another example, although an exceptional one, is the paintings in the Stoa Poikile in Athens, an homage to Miltiades authorized by the polis but financed by his son Cimon, or by someone in his circle of friends, to adorn a public building.[57] The right granted individuals who had financed a victorious dithyrambic chorus in Athens to erect a monument holding the prize tripod in a public space such as the so-called Street of the Tripods can be understood in a similar light, although this is not specifically a reward for a benefaction.

The ambiguity surrounding this type of reward made it easier for the recipient to proceed in a way typical of the exchange of gifts and of euergetism. In exploiting this ambiguity, the recipient attempted to unbalance the relationship in his own favor by indebting the other party. The same ambiguity was used by Pindar to inculcate the message that the *epinikion* was not only a reward granted by the polis but also a benefaction from the athlete. *Isthmian* 1 includes a passage in which this duality and the way the transition from reward to gift takes place can be seen in the space of a few lines. After observing that "it is necessary to give those who achieve it a lordly vaunt with no begrudging thoughts," Pindar adds, "since it is a light gift for a man who is wise to speak a good word in return for labors of all kinds and to raise up a noble tribute shared by all." Despite superficial differences, this is similar to what Eumenes II does in an inscription mentioned in Chapter 1: after being rewarded by Delphi with a festival in his honor, he responds by creating a foundation to finance the festival, transforming a reward granted by the polis into a gift to it.[58]

It has been suggested that the polis commissioned *epinikia* and even funded the re-performance of them in civic festivals.[59] If this is true – the second scenario is particularly controversial[60] – we would have *epinikia* that were unambiguous rewards from the polis like *sitêsis* and *proedria*.

[57] For the paintings, see Paus. 1. 15. 3. Aeschines' claim (3. 182) that Miltiades asked that his name be inscribed but was only allowed to be represented as a special protagonist in the painting is an anachronism from the time when the rewards granted to generals in comparison to fifth-century practice were a matter of debate. But Aeschines is right to see the painting as an honor awarded to Miltiades; see Chapter 4, Section 2.2.

[58] Pi. *I.* 1. 44–7. Delphi: Bringmann and von Steuben 1995: no. 93 [E 1] and *Syll.*^{3} 671 B = Bringmann and von Steuben 1995: no. 93 [E 2].

[59] Currie 2004; Currie 2011.

[60] Cf. Carey 2007: 201 n. 11: "Except in the case of autocrats, or states which had few and infrequent victories to celebrate, there can have been little incentive for the community to sanction a civic celebration of an old victory." Cf. also Morrison 2012: 112.

There is indeed evidence of *epinikia* performed in civic festivals (which already represented polis rewards, regardless of who commissioned them).[61] While some epinikian passages mention the patronage of private individuals, however, none refer to polis patronage.[62] Apparently the *epinikia* commissioned by the polis were at most a minority. It seems that *epinikia* belonged principally to the category of reward that involved almost as much of gift as of counter-gift, a pattern that fits better with the status and intentions of the athlete, who was a member of the elite seeking prestige.[63] During the celebration of his victory, he probably preferred to prolong his role as benefactor rather than to take a step back in his position of superiority by acting as recipient rather than donor.

In other ways, however, *epinikia* were closer to rewards like *sitêsis* and *proedria*, for they too constituted a gift for the descendants and not only the benefactor. The athlete's victory and the *epinikion* that commemorated it brought prestige to the entire family, as reflected by the *epinikia* themselves: "The shaker of the earth who dwells at Onchestus and at the sea-bridge before the walls of Corinth, by offering to that family this marvelous song, wakes from her bed their ancient fame for glorious deeds." The re-performance of the *epinikion* in the *oikos* before an audience not consisting exclusively of relatives offered the possibility of preserving this symbolic capital to later generations.[64]

2 Non-institutionalized reciprocity

The fact that the archaic polis rewarded foreigners but not citizens as *euergetai* (with the exception of athletes victorious in Panhellenic games) does not imply that at this time citizens never rendered significant services or made major gifts to the polis. Even the limited evidence we have is sufficient to show the opposite: one segment of the citizen body, the elite, made contributions worthy of the *euergetai* of later periods, which is to say that the fundamental element needed to make civic euergetism – an euergetism in which citizens play the role of *euergetai* – possible was already

[61] For example, Pi. *O.* 9 and perhaps *P.* 2 and *I.* 4 (see Carey 2007: 201–2).

[62] See Currie 2011: 273–4.

[63] Kyle 1987; Kurke 1991; Mann 2001; Pritchard 2003; Nicholson 2005; this is true even if, as Hubbard 2008: 385 suggests, he did not belong to the "traditional, hereditary, landed aristocracy." Young's thesis regarding the early professionalization of Greek athletics and early participation of non-elite citizens is unconvincing (D. Young 1984; cf. Hubbard 2008: 383–4). On the debate about the social background of athletes, see also Fisher 2009: 537–8.

[64] Pi. *I.* 4. 19–23. On this passage and the cultivation of family prestige through re-performance of *epinikia*, see Morrison 2012: 113–14.

in place. What is more, the community perceived some of these contributions as benefactions, another essential aspect for the emergence of euergetism, while others were the object of a non-institutionalized exchange between the elite and the rest of the community. The archaic polis was thus much closer to civic euergetism than its institutions might suggest.

2.1 Elite contributions

The donations and services archaic elites offered for the benefit of the community have received little attention from modern historians. Many have focused instead on the selfishness of the aristocracy and its tendency to distance itself from the rest of the community. Chester Starr, for example, declares, "the aristocracies of the Greek states sought their own advantage in ways which almost disrupted society."[65] Starr's characterization is not wrong, but it describes only one aspect of relations between the elite and the archaic polis. Equally relevant are the significant contributions made by elite members that, despite initial appearances, are quite compatible with their alleged "selfishness" and aloofness.[66] Information on such matters is limited, so the survey that follows is necessarily based on both direct and indirect evidence, and it includes some thoughts about the factors that facilitated elite contributions and arguably made them inevitable.

It is important to recognize, first of all, that the historical process that led from the Dark Age community to the archaic polis, a far more complex community with more public expenses (e.g., for festivals, defense, and construction), was not accompanied by the development of a financial organization capable of handling such costs, even if recent investigations indicate that archaic fiscal systems were more advanced than has traditionally been supposed.[67] The idea of collecting direct taxes either per capita or according to income was unwelcome, and only tyrants dared attempt it. Public income drawn from renting communal land or from fines was insufficient to cover all expenses even in poleis where tyrants collected taxes.[68] As a consequence, the archaic polis was forced to appeal to individuals who could cover such expenses or dedicate time to unpaid public functions; in this period, political and economic conditions meant that this group alone could be the social elite. Indeed, financial needs of this sort were probably among the factors that contributed to the

[65] Starr 1986: 28. See also Starr 1977: 119–21; Gschnitzer 1981: 60–2; Stein-Hölkeskamp 1989.
[66] Stahl 1987: 88; Domingo Gygax 2006a; Duplouy 2006.
[67] Cf. van Wees 2013.
[68] Ehrenberg 1957–1958: vol. 1, 62–4; Snodgrass 1980: 24–5; Bleicken 1985: 161; C. Meier 1986: 25–37; Morris 2009: 72; van Wees 2009: 461.

replacement of *basileis* by oligarchies at the head of the poleis.[69] The members of the elite, meanwhile, were the individuals most interested in making the city-state a viable enterprise.[70] To a considerable extent, the archaic polis was *their* polis, and they were accordingly deeply engaged in its proper functioning. They possessed additional political rights, obtained more economic benefits, and enjoyed better living conditions.[71]

At the same time, the contributions of the elite to the polis represented a reaction to negative consequences of the city from which they, paradoxically, obtained so many benefits. The emergence of the polis obliged them to coexist closely with the demos – in the assembly, cult places, and the army – which led to a reaction characteristic of any social elite that feels too close to the masses: the need to distinguish itself. The archaic elite tried to do this in two fundamental ways: by claiming noble origins[72] and by cultivating a new lifestyle. While Homeric heroes occasionally still worked in the *oikos* and on the land,[73] seventh- and sixth-centuries elites preferred to devote their time to sports, hunting, politics, poetry, and music – in other words, to activities that implied that they had freed themselves from the need to do physical labor, and that were inaccessible to peasants, artisans, and traders.[74] Everything that indicated the ability to enjoy this lifestyle was appreciated, and archaic poetry, vase paintings, funerary reliefs, and grave-goods accordingly reflect a tendency to luxury and the squandering of resources. Some of this ostentatious waste took place in private circles (e.g., symposia), but some involved contributions to the polis.

Members of the elite used contributions to the polis, however, to increase their distance not only from the demos but also from their fellows as well. An agonistic desire to surpass others was deeply rooted in Greek culture, but members of the archaic elite had few opportunities to measure

[69] Cf. *Od.* 13. 1–15, where King Alcinous, rather than assume the costs of the hospitality he offers Odysseus, makes the *dêmos* pay for it. See Vlachos 1974: 68; van Wees 1992: 35–6. On the transition from *basileis* to oligarchies, see Hall 2014: 126–37.

[70] On the archaic polis as a primitive state society (not a stateless society), see van Wees 2013 and Hall 2014: 126–43.

[71] On some of these questions, see Pekáry 1979: 16; Gschnitzer 1981: 62–3; Vernant 1982: 73; Crielaard 2009; Rose 2012; Hall 2014: 211–13.

[72] Starr 1986: 60; Stein-Hölkeskamp 1989: 22–4; Rose 2009: 474; Rose 2012: 127–9, 244–5; Wecowski 2014: 24.

[73] *Il.* 4. 476–7; 6. 314; 17. 301–3; 18. 550 ff.; *Od.* 2. 127; 18. 288, 365 ff.; 19. 109 ff.; 23. 189 ff.

[74] On the aristocratic lifestyle in the archaic age, see Starr 1977: 119–21; Donlan 1980: 35–7; Vernant 1982: 72–4; Stein-Hölkeskamp 1989: 104–6; Kurke 1992; Murray 1993: 201–3; Morris 2000: 178–80; Balot 2006: 35–7; Morris 2009: 73–4; van Wees 2009: 446–7, 464; Hall 2014: 171–2; Wecowski 2014.

themselves against one other on the battlefield. Unlike the Roman aristocracy of the Republican period, the archaic Greek elite did not engage in great wars of conquest, and the hoplite phalanx was not a showcase for individual brilliance in any case. Athletic competition was one important locus for inter-elite competition. Engagement with the polis through services and donations became another, since it allowed a man to show himself a cut above others before the community as a whole and not only before peers at symposia.[75]

These contributions consisted, first of all, in the assumption of responsibility for the costs of public functions.[76] If a man performed a religious duty, for example, he paid the costs (or at least some of the costs) associated with the animal sacrifice, including for the cult instruments and auxiliary personnel.[77] Proof of this is that the occupation of public positions in archaic Athens required a significant patrimony: "Appointment to the supreme offices of state went by birth and wealth," reports the pseudo-Aristotelian *Athenaion Politeia* in regard to Dracon's constitution. Under Solon, income was the only criterion for access to public positions.[78]

The polis elite must also have contributed decisively to public construction. As Ian Morris notes, "there was an explosion of temple-building around 700. By 650, every little village had its own temple, and big sites had monumental stone structures with clay roof tiles, architectural terracottas, and pedimental structures."[79] Construction of these buildings required that wood be imported and artisans and sculptors paid. By some estimates, at this time such transactions constituted the main expense for a polis besides war.[80] As noted earlier, financing for such projects is unlikely to have been obtained exclusively through taxes and war booty, and the elite probably played a decisive role by helping to provide the workforce and materials, as well as by furnishing money.[81] In this sense, the generous contribution of the Alcmaeonidae to the reconstruction of the temple of Apollo at Delphi at the end of the sixth century can be seen as a spectacular example of what occurred routinely on

[75] On this search for symbolic capital, see R. Osborne 2009: 232; Hall 2007b: 44.
[76] Ehrenberg 1957–1958: vol. 1, 64; Bleicken 1985: 159; C. Meier 1986; R. Parker 1996: 27.
[77] See, for example, van Wees 2013: 76, on the pre-Solonian system of funding sacrifices in Athens.
[78] [Arist.] *Ath.* 3. 1 (Dracon); 7. 3–4 (Solon).
[79] Morris 1998: 19. See also Murray 1993^{2}: 242, and the list of temples built during these centuries in R. Osborne 2009: 249–50.
[80] Starr 1986: 58.
[81] Starr 1986: 58 (taxes and war booty); van Wees 2009 (booty). Cf. C. Morgan 1990: 5; R. Parker 1996: 27; R. Osborne 2009: 256.

a local level in connection with city temples.[82] The Rhoecus temple on Samos, for example, and the treasure houses on the acropolis in Athens seem to have been financed by members of the elite.[83] It can also be assumed that the tendency of ancient authors (as well as modern ones) to connect important construction projects to important names means that some buildings attributed to archaic tyrants were in fact financed by individual citizens. The region of Cyzicus and Lampsacus furnishes one of the few solid bits of epigraphic evidence for such activity: an inscription on a column from the end of the sixth century at the latest, in honor of two individuals who made construction of a temple roof possible.[84] Similar evidence comes from a mid-sixth-century stele from Thessaly, which Lillian Jeffery argues "records the generosity of a citizen who during his tenure of the office of judge (*dikastôr*) provided the roof for a public building (or possibly the whole building)."[85]

The way Herodotus refers to the participation of the Alcmaeonidae in the reconstruction of the temple of Apollo is revealing: their donation is a logical consequence of their status. Put another way, individuals of high social rank made other people come to expect such gestures:

> They hired themselves to the Amphictyons for the building of the temple at Delphi, which now is but then as yet was not there. Being wealthy and like their fathers men of reputation, they wrought the temple into a fairer form than the model shown; in particular, whereas they had agreed to build the temple of tufa, they made its front of Parian marble.[86]

Another field in which the elite made significant contributions was at community festivals, where sacrifices, banquets, musical performances, and athletic competitions involved huge expenses.[87] As previously noted, members of the elite certainly sponsored the feasts that accompanied the performance of *epinikia* to celebrate athletic victories by members of their own households. But they also contributed decisively to the periodic

[82] Hdt. 5. 62; Pi. *P.* 7. 9–12.
[83] See de Libero 1996: 97, 408; Scholl 2006: 35–6; Connelly 2014: 59; Carty 2015: 44–6, 127, 130.
[84] Jeffery 1990[2]: 367, and pl. 71 no. 50. Although Jeffery considers both men "benefactors of the temple," probably only the first was a benefactor and the second was the architect (Robert 1950: 80).
[85] Jeffery 1990[2]: 61, 97 (quotation), pl. 11 no. 2.
[86] Hdt. 5. 62 (tr. Godley). Stahl 1987: 120–33, has shown that the version of Hdt. 5. 62 and Pi. *P.* 7. 9–12, which highlights the generosity of the Alcmaeonidae, is more credible than the one that can be inferred from later sources such as Isocrates, Demosthenes, Ps.-Aristotle's *Athenaion Politeia*, and Philochorus. These sources have been used by some scholars (e.g., Berve 1967: 70; Virgilio 1975: 85–6; Nenci 1994: 248) to affirm that the Alcmaeonidae took advantage of being in charge of reconstructing the temple to collect funds to fight the Pisistratidae.
[87] One of the main functions of Solon's calendar of sacrifices was to calculate expenses (R. Parker 1996: 43–5, esp. 52–3).

festivals in classical Athens, and matters cannot have been much different in the archaic polis. Although the archaic cities' festivals were fewer and less expensive, the contributions of the Athenian elite to festivals in the classical period must have continued an archaic tradition.[88]

Contributions by the elite were not limited to the public sphere, for they might also help humble people by providing them with food, clothes, money, or accommodations.[89] This is how Solon's father presumably behaved, if it is true, as Plutarch claims, that his patrimony was eventually much diminished as a result of his *philanthrôpia*. This is also the type of action that an early fifth-century personality such as Cimon continued to perform.[90] The thesis that such actions might be regarded as a "contribution to the polis" and as a service potentially susceptible of belonging to an euergetic exchange nonetheless requires defense, for it has been observed that

> On a crucial point, euergetism is diametrically opposed to these archaic liberalities offered to foreigners, to friends, to clients or to anybody at all. *Euergesiai* were, on the contrary, offered to the city as a whole and only to the city. They were civic. . . . If his *euergesia* [that of the *euergetês*] was aimed merely at *some* of the citizens, that would constitute corruption, or even the purchasing of a clientele.[91]

It is true that in the Greek polis generally, and in the democratic polis of the classical period in particular, gifts to individuals might be understood as bribes and were for this reason not always well regarded.[92] But it is also true that the distinction between services to individuals and to the community was often unclear, and that the limits were more flexible than Veyne's quotation suggests. In fourth-century Athens, where the idea of "service to the polis" was much better defined than it was in archaic times, some individuals who had been brought to trial defended themselves by referring not only to benefactions addressed to the whole polis but also to those performed for smaller groups and individuals. In a speech by Lysias, for example, the defendant reminds the jury that his father "joined privately in portioning daughters and sisters of certain needy citizens: there were men whom he ransomed from the enemy, and others for whose

[88] On the continuities between the archaic and the classical ages, see R. Parker 1996: 127–8; Wilson 2000: 14.
[89] Veyne 1976a: 186–8; Stein-Hölkeskamp 1989: 213; Cecchet 2014.
[90] Plu. *Sol.* 2. 1. On Cimon, see [Arist.] *Ath.* 27. 3; Ath. 12. 532f–3c.
[91] Veyne 1990: 75 (in the French version Veyne 1976a: 188–9).
[92] See [Arist.] *Ath.* 55. 5; Din. 1. 43. Presents from foreigners could also be problematic: Hyp. 5. 25; 6. 10; Aeschin. 3. 259; D. 19. 139–40, 145, 166–8, 264–6, 273; Din. 1. 40; 3. 2; *Syll.*[3] 360.

funerals he provided money."[93] With such statements, defendants attempted to evoke the gratitude (*charis*) of the jury, which could only happen if such benefactions were regarded as services to the community as a whole. This is corroborated by the fact that in such proceedings, wealthy citizens might be accused of the opposite, of having taken insufficient care of needy fellow citizens.[94] Isocrates defends the position that the existence of wealthy individuals is a positive thing precisely because they care for the poor.[95] Every member of the jury, every citizen, might in the future find himself needing services provided by the rich. Only needy individuals took advantage of this option, but all were potential beneficiaries. In addition, assisting the needy was regarded as a contribution to peaceful, harmonious community relations. Democritus (*ca*. 460–385 BC) expresses this idea as follows:

> Whensoever those with means have the nerve to lend to those who have none, to do them services and kindnesses – that is when you first find pity and an end to isolation, the birth of comradeship, mutual assistance and concord among the citizens, and other blessings so many that none could count them.[96]

Democritus was not thinking of revolutionary action (such as a redistribution of private property by the state) in line with some "utopias" of his time (e.g., that of Phaleas of Chalcedon), but of benefactions in the archaic style, like those of Cimon.[97] The beneficial effects for the community of this type of gift, of which fifth-century Greeks were certainly aware, cannot have been overlooked by the archaic elite in a society full of inequality and social tension. Indeed, this must have been one of the first types of support that elite members wishing to contribute to the polis considered offering, since it was addressed to individuals of their own *oikos* and their neighbors. The elite also personified the state, so that the

[93] Lys. 19. 59. In another speech by Lysias, the defendant explains that when he saw that "true and ardent patriots lacked means for service expenses," he suggested that "the well-to-do ought to provide what was necessary for those in needy circumstances" and set an example by giving 30 drachmas to each (16. 14). Andocides (1. 147) says in his own defense, "our house is the oldest in Athens, and has always been the first to open its doors to those in need."

[94] D. 18. 311; 45. 69–70. [95] Isoc. 7. 32.

[96] Democr. 68 B 255 (D–K); translation by Procopé 1990: 40. "Those with means" translates *hoi dynamenoi*, which some scholars translate as "those in power" (Barnes 2001: 277; Gagarin and Woodruff 1995: 158–9; Cartledge 1999: 41). The latter translation suggests control of political power alone. But *hoi dynamenoi* stands in contrast with *tois mê echousi*, "those who have nothing" (LSJ, s.v. *dynamai*, 452), so that "those with means" or "die Vermögenden" (Diels and Kranz 1951–1952: 196) is a more suitable translation of *hoi dynamenoi*, "the upper classes" (cf. Th. 6. 39. 2), the "rich and powerful" (Procopé 1990: 40; see also Cartledge 1999: 41).

[97] Procopé 1989: 326–8.

distinction between the private and public actions of its members was more blurred than it was in the classical polis. "Archaic liberalities" were thus regarded as contributions to the community already in the archaic age and cannot be understood as "diametrically opposed" to euergetism. The Athenian liturgy of the *hestiasis* that is so reminiscent of archaic liberalities, consisting as it did of offering banquets to fellow tribe members at festivals such as the Dionysia and the Panathenaea,[98] was perhaps rooted partly in this conception of liberalities as services to the community, and not exclusively in the pragmatism of sharing costs associated with festivals.[99]

2.2 *Archaic liturgies*

This hypothesis regarding the origin of the *hestiasis* introduces another essential feature of contributions made by the elite. At some point in the archaic age, the polis began to organize such contributions through liturgies: projects for the polis' benefit assigned to individuals who were required to supply the means necessary to carry them out. The system of liturgies is generally associated with democratic Athens in the classical period, when the state's wealthiest citizens were obliged to take turns assuming responsibility for such burdens. But many scholars agree that compulsory liturgies must have been preceded by a stage at which liturgies were voluntary, and this phase most likely goes back to the archaic period.[100]

The word *leitourgia* derives from *lêito-* (which in turn is formed from *laos*) and the root *erg-* (*ergon, erdô*). The word *laos* is "ancient and rare," [101] which might be a hint that the term *leitourgia* comes from the archaic period.[102] In addition, *leitourgia* literally means "work for the people,"[103] which can in principle refer to both voluntary and obligatory actions, once again raising the possibility that it originated at a time when liturgies were voluntary. But regardless of when the term *leitourgia* was coined, simultaneous with spontaneous and improvised contributions must have been

[98] D. 1. 36; 20. 18, 21–2; 21. 13; 39. 7; schol. D. 20. 21.
[99] Cf. Veyne 1976a: 186; Schmitt Pantel 1992: 123–31. On the differences between the public and the private spheres, see de Polignac and Schmitt Pantel 1998; Ismard 2010.
[100] Will 1972: 459–60; Finley 1973: 151; Lauffer 1974: 147; Gschnitzer 1981: 141; Bleicken 1985: 159–60; Ober 1989: 199; Domingo Gygax 2006a: 282–3.
[101] Frisk 1960–72: vol. 2, 83; Chantraine 1968: 619 (quotation). Cf. Beekes 2010: 832–3.
[102] At Hdt. 7. 197. 2, *lêiton* means "town-hall," while the most ancient evidence for *leitourgia* comes from late fifth-century orators (e.g., And. 4. 42; Lys. 21. 19). See Lewis 1960: 176, 181.
[103] Strathmann 1938: 222–3; Lewis 1960: 177; Finley 1973: 151; Beekes 2010: 832–3.

contributions that required organization and planning, such as those made to periodic festivals. The polis needed to know well in advance if any citizens were willing to take on the organization and financing of festivals; if there were more volunteers than necessary as a result of the agonistic spirit and exhibitionism of members of the elite, it had to be able to decide who would be assigned these services.

According to the Ps.-Aristotelian *Oeconomica*, in Hippias' time there were trierarchies, phylarchies, choregies, and "other liturgies" in Athens.[104] As Peter Wilson has pointed out, "it is not inconceivable that a memory of ancient practice should be preserved here in a form heavily coloured by contemporary arrangements." This information is preserved, in fact, in a passage of the *Oeconomica* that contains, alongside anachronistic elements, verifiable data such as the demonetization of coinage by Hippias. The existence of choregies also fits with both the tyrants' policy of promoting festivals and the elite's desire for display and performance.[105] Van Wees, on the other hand, has concluded in a recent analysis of the archaic Athenian system of public finance that it was Hippias who began the construction of public triremes.[106]

Hints of the existence of archaic liturgies can be found elsewhere as well. Demosthenes begins his speech against Phaenippus by asserting that Solon "established the *antidosis* law," which regulated some aspects of the assignment of liturgies by the state discussed at the end of this section.[107] The reference to Solon is suspicious, since attributing a law to him was a means of investing it with authority. But the text at least shows that it was conceivable to Demosthenes and his audience that liturgies went back to the archaic age.[108] Equally interesting is a passage from the *Constitution of the Athenians* attributed to Xenophon that refers to individuals devoted to athletic and musical activities.[109] Although the text has been interpreted in

[104] [Arist.] *Oec*. 1347[a]11–14: "Those who were expecting to equip a war-vessel or preside over a tribe or train a chorus or undertake the expense of some other public service of the kind, he allowed, if they chose, to commute the service for a moderate sum, and to be enrolled on the list of those who had performed it" (tr. Armstrong).

[105] Wilson 2000: 15. That the reference to liturgies in Ps.-Aristotle can be treated as historical is accepted by Reisch 1899: 2409; Oehler 1925: 1873; Cornelius 1929: 54; van Groningen 1933: 72–3; Treu 1958; Berve 1967: vol. 1, 70, vol. 2, 560–1; Domingo Gygax 2006a; Schubert 2008: 49–50; van Wees 2013: 66–7, 98–100. Cf. Kahrstedt 1934: 227.

[106] Van Wees 2013: 64–8.

[107] D. 42. 1; Solon fr. 107 (Ruschenbusch).

[108] Despite the mention of Solon, some scholars consider the information offered by Demosthenes authentic: Böckh 1886: vol. 1, 534; Goligher 1907: 481–2; Oehler 1925: 1873; Freeman 1926: 128–9; Gernet 1957: 75. Christ 1990: 161 n. 68 regards it as "dubious." Gabrielsen 1987: 17 rejects it.

[109] [X.] *Ath*. 1. 13. The main sentence reads "the people have overthrown (*katalelyken*) those engaged with athletics and musical activities because they do not think it honorable." The author then discusses the choregies, gymnasiarchies, and trierarchies of his time.

many ways, Max Treu has shown that for Ps.-Xenophon the gymnasiarchies and choregies of classical times were preceded in the pre-Cleisthenic period by a different way of financing athletic and musical activities.[110] If that is correct, Ps.-Xenophon may have had in mind a time when the elite voluntarily assumed gymnasiarchies and choregies. Also worth noting is a passage in Herodotus, who reports that during the struggle for independence against Epidaurus (around 600 BC), the Aeginetans appointed ten *chorêgoi* for a festival.[111] Herodotus might have been thinking of chorus directors such as those mentioned by Alcman,[112] but it is also possible that he is referring to liturgists.[113] This would not prove that liturgists existed in archaic Aegina, but it does indicate again that in the fifth century, liturgies were perceived as a very old institution. From Samos in the time of Polycrates, we hear of a practice that may also refer to a form of liturgy: the mothers of fallen soldiers were assigned to rich citizens, who became responsible for their maintenance.[114]

I conclude this survey of evidence for archaic liturgies with an Athenian institution that Greek sources call *naukrariai*. In this case, there can be no doubt that this was an archaic institution. The *naukrariai* go back to the pre-Solonian age,[115] are mentioned in several laws of Solon,[116] and disappear around 500 BC. Of the various interpretations,[117] the most plausible is that these were subdivisions within the citizenry for the equipment and maintenance of ships.[118] The *naukrariai* were led by *naukraroi* – originally "ship commanders" – who seem to have been entrusted with organizational matters such as obtaining the means required to equip and maintain ships.[119] These must have been wealthy men who, when necessary, added

[110] Treu 1958 followed by Wilson 2000: 13–14.
[111] Hdt. 5. 83. The battles against Epidaurus cannot have taken place later than 550 BC, at which point Aegina issued its own coins. On the date of Aegina's independence, see Figueira 1983–1984: 8–29.
[112] Alcm. PMG 1 (cf. West 1992: 36–7); Reisch 1899: 2423; Strasburger 1984: s.v. "Auxesia"; Davies 1992: 29 n. 63; Hornblower 2013: 238.
[113] Böckh 1886: vol. 1, 368; LSJ s.v. *chorêgos*; Powell 1938: s.v. *chorêgos*; Giraudeau 1984: 13; Figueira 1985: 51; Wilson 2000: 281.
[114] Duris of Samos *FGrH* 76 F 63. Cf. van Wees 2013: 100.
[115] [Arist.] *Ath.* 8. 3; schol. Ar. *Nu.* 37. Taking Hdt. 5. 71 as additional evidence of pre-Solonian *naukrariai* is problematic (cf. Th. 1. 126–7; Plu. *Sol.* 12), although some scholars do so: Hignett 1952: 20, 67, 311; Walter 1993: 189.
[116] [Arist.] *Ath.* 8. 3.
[117] Jordan 1979: 56–72 and Rihll 1987: 10 derive the word, respectively, from *naos* ("temple") and *naiein* ("live"). See also Gabrielsen 1985: 21–51; Schubert 2008: 48; Pritchard 2010: 10.
[118] Poll. 8. 108. See Vélissaropoulos 1980: 14–16; Schmitz 1995: 585, 594; Ostwald 1995: 368–79; Rhodes 2000: 745–6; D. Kienast 2005: 78–9; van Wees 2013: 44–61. Cf. Wallinga 2000.
[119] Solon's laws refer to the treasury of the *naukraroi* ([Arist.] *Ath.* 8. 3). On the economic functions of the *naukraroi*, see also Androtion *FGrH* 324 F 36 = schol. Ar. *Av.* 1541.

resources from their own pockets.[120] Everything thus indicates that the *naukrariai* were connected with liturgies similar to the *triêrarchiai*, in accord with a definition of *naukraroi* from a Byzantine lexicon: "the ones responsible for the preparation of ships, who served as trierarchs."[121]

It thus seems likely on multiple grounds that liturgies already existed in the archaic polis. If so, the next question is whether such liturgies were exclusively voluntary. Scholars generally maintain that obligatory liturgies were an innovation of classical Athens.[122] But the evidence on which this thesis rests can be reduced to the passage in Ps.-Xenophon cited earlier.[123] The judgment is based on the apparent absence of proof of obligatory liturgies in the archaic age, and on an assumption that the imposition of liturgies on the elite could only have occurred in a city dominated by the demos, the enforced liturgy being a result of class struggle or, at least, of the "appropriation" by the demos of the elite's penchant for agonistic display. Some scholars have also been influenced by the tendency to highlight the differences between Athens before and after Cleisthenes (a tendency that might have affected Ps.-Xenophon).

It would not be surprising, however, if obligatory liturgies were introduced during the archaic age.[124] A polis could afford to postpone the completion of a temple, but it could not suspend sacrifices to the gods or other activities in their honor if there were too few volunteers to bear the costs of a festival. Nor could a polis renounce possessing and maintaining ships if they were needed for defense. The main difference in relation to democratic Athens must thus have been that members of the archaic elite who performed liturgies were obliged to pay for them by their class peers rather than by the demos. But this would have been natural if the archaic polis is understood, as argued earlier, as an institution rendering services primarily in the elite's interest. Moreover, if Pisistratid Athens included such an "un-Greek" practice as direct taxation, it is difficult to understand why there might not have been another, far more "worthy" form of compulsory contribution such as obligatory liturgies.[125]

[120] C. Meier 1986: 28; Figueira 2011: 188–9; van Wees 2013: 54–5.
[121] *Anecdota Bekker* p. 283. 20–1.
[122] Finley 1973: 151; Veyne 1976a: 184–6; Humphreys 1978: 256–7; Donlan 1980: 203 n. 21; Bleicken 1985: 163; Stahl 1987: 141, 198; Kurke 1991: 89, 167–9; Schmitt Pantel 1992: 125; von Reden 1995: 84; Christ 2006: 160.
[123] [X.] *Ath.* 1. 13. Curiously, most scholars who defend this thesis do not cite the passage.
[124] Lauffer 1974: 147 takes it for granted that this was possible. See also Ostwald 1995: 373, 374, 378.
[125] On Pisistratid taxes, see Hdt. 1. 64. 1; [Arist.] *Ath.* 16. 4, 6; D.L. 1. 53; van Wees 2013: 84–5; Hall 2014: 267.

Two of the previously mentioned sources, the Ps.-Aristotelian *Oeconomica* and Demosthenes, refer to archaic liturgies as obligatory.[126] In addition, a sentence quoted from a Solonian law ("if anyone disputes a *naukraria*") seems connected with the possibility for men designated *naukraroi* to contest the assumption of the *naukraria*.[127] Demosthenes says outright that the institution of *antidosis* ("exchange") already existed in the archaic period. This would mean that already then a liturgist who believed that a wealthier fellow citizen had been improperly exempted from a liturgy he had been assigned could issue a challenge, forcing the exempted individual to choose either bearing the costs of the liturgy or exchanging fortunes.[128] The *antidosis* is a strange institution in the fifth and fourth centuries, when the use of money was so developed that it was easy to conceal assets.[129] Banks were not subject to state inspection,[130] and there was no land registry that allowed one to trace the holdings of the wealthy, who often owned property in different parts of Attica.[131] As Gabrielsen observes, in most cases it was "virtually impossible to obtain a picture of a man's economic standing that was more or less accurate."[132] In contrast, as Gernet points out, *antidosis* fits well in archaic society, where gift-exchange and challenges were characteristic of aristocratic culture and individual wealth was easier to estimate.[133] Solon's census classes, which established political rights and military obligations, were a good basis for determining which Athenians were capable of performing liturgies. In fact, the purpose of the Solonian classification was to distinguish rights and duties within the elite rather than within the entire population, since the Solonian upper classes were all very wealthy. On the other hand, if we look at the distribution of offices in the archaic polis (characterized by the principle of rotation as well), we again find that offices were not only an honor but also a duty, and that a neglected duty could be punished by imposition of a fine.[134]

[126] [Arist.] *Oec.* 1347[a]11–14; D. 42. 1.
[127] Photius *v* 39. On this interpretation, see van Wees 2013: 45, 55.
[128] On the *antidosis*, see Gernet 1957: 71–7; Harrison 1968: 268–9; MacDowell 1978: 162–4; Gabrielsen 1987: 7–38; Christ 1990: 147–69; Apostolakis 2006.
[129] Gernet 1957: 75. Goligher 1907: 481–2 offers a similar interpretation, but his argument is less sophisticated. On invisible wealth, see Gernet 1968: 405–14; Cohen 1992: 191–3.
[130] Christ 2006: 193. [131] Christ 1990: 158.
[132] Gabrielsen 1986: 110–11. See also Christ 1990: 159. There is only one documented case of an exchange of fortunes (Lys. 4. 1).
[133] Gernet 1957: 75.
[134] On the Solonian classes, see R. Osborne 2009: 208. On archaic offices, see Gehrke 2009: 398, 406.

2.3 *Benefactions and reciprocity*

Although the archaic polis offered a wide range of public honors for foreign benefactors and athletes, nothing suggests that individuals received any formal reward for the previously mentioned contributions to the polis. Of course, some contributions that to Greeks of classical and Hellenistic times would have seemed like benefactions were not perceived as such in the archaic age. There was no awareness of the possibility of a system of public funding like that of Athens in the classical period. Although war booty and other resources were used to finance public enterprises,[135] that the wealthy would pay must have been such a common practice that it was "natural" behavior. What is more, the fact that the elite had to assume many burdens of the polis was taken for granted to the extent that such conduct was a part of elite identity, as is apparent from Herodotus' description of the participation of the Alcmaeonidae in the reconstruction of Apollo's temple at Delphi: "Being wealthy and, like their fathers, men of reputation, they wrought the temple into a fairer form than the model shown."[136] Making contributions meant *performing* the role of a member of the elite, which is to say that this was, in a sense, as much a privilege as a favor to the community.

The notion of benefaction

These considerations are insufficient, however, to explain the lack of honors, since in some cases donations were surely perceived as benefactions. Thus Xenophanes, in the poem whose opening lines (1–10) were cited earlier, mentions the enormous honors (*proedria, sitêsis* and *dôreai*) with which Olympic victors were showered by the polis and argues that they do not deserve as much as he does, and then he writes:

> For our expertise is better than the strength of men and horses.
> But this practice makes no sense nor is it right
> to prefer strength to this good expertise.
> For neither if there were a good boxer among the people
> nor if there were a pentathlete or wrestler
> nor again if there were someone swift afoot –
> which is most honored of all men's deeds of strength –
> would for this reason a city be better governed.
> Small joy would a city have from this –
> if someone were to be victorious in competing for a prize on Pisa's banks –
> for these do not enrich a city's treasure room.[137]

[135] See the recent study by van Wees 2013. [136] Hdt. 5. 62 (tr. Godley).
[137] Fr. 2. 11–22 West² (tr. Lesher 1992: 13–15).

Xenophanes' message is clear: expertise (*sophiê*) such as his, the ability to contribute to the good governance of the polis and increase the public treasury, is more deserving of honors than the strength that allows a man to achieve an Olympic victory, because the former represent a more substantial contribution to the common good.[138] Xenophanes' intention is to vindicate the value of the advice offered in his poems,[139] but to do so, he highlights the value he places on certain contributions to the polis, a value that far exceeds the one he places on athletic victories (whose worth he does not deny completely, but which he regards as minor in comparison: "small joy would a city have from this – if someone were to be victorious"). Although Xenophanes does not use the term *euergesiai*, he evidently regards his contributions as benefactions, and as such he considers them worthy of honors. Plato, who echoes this text in a passage of the *Apology*, expresses some of Xenophanes' ideas even more explicitly: Socrates claims that given his devotion to teaching the Athenians to care for public matters rather than their own interests, he should be considered an *euergetês* and awarded *sitêsis* in the prytaneion far more than an Olympic victor, because "he makes you seem to be happy, whereas I make you happy in reality."[140]

The mid-seventh-century Spartan poet Tyrtaeus offers similar remarks, insisting that it is better to be a good soldier than a good athlete.[141] Tyrtaeus is referring to a type of service that is further from the contributions by the elite mentioned in the previous sections of this chapter (2.2.1–2) than the good governance and enrichment of the polis Xenophanes discusses. Tyrtaeus' poem nonetheless contains the idea of public benefaction: "This is a common benefit (*esthlon*) for the state and all the people, whenever a man with firm stance among the front ranks never ceases to hold his ground." The poem also shows that the community rewards a man who serves the polis in this way. If he dies on the battlefield, "young and old alike mourn him, all the city is distressed by the painful loss, and his tomb and children are pointed out among the people, and his children's children and his line after them." Whereas if he survives,

[138] This interpretation essentially agrees with that of Marcovich 1978: 19 (followed by Heitsch 1983: 110; Adkins 1985: 198; Lesher 1992: 57): "In short, the message of the whole poem boils down to this: 'Only a useful wisdom (such a one as my own) can bring about good government (on which the well-being of the city depends): no athlete's strength can'." On other passages that also reject the model of the athlete in favor of more useful social archetypes, see Morris 2000: 185.

[139] Lesher 1992: 58.

[140] *Ap.* 36d (cf. *R.* 465d). On the relationship between Xenophanes and Plato, see Marcovich 1978: 19–20, 25; Lesher 1992: 60. There are echoes of similar ideas in E. fr. 282. 13–28 ap. Ath. 10. 413c ff.; Isoc. 4. 1–2.

[141] Tyrt. fr. 12 West².

He is honored by all, young and old alike, many are the joys he experiences before he goes to Hades, and in his old age he stands out among the townsmen; no one seeks to deprive him of respect and his just rights, but all men at the benches yield their place to him, the young, those of his own age, and the elders.

Tyrtaeus is not referring to official honors such as *proedria*,[142] but to the spontaneous gratitude felt by fellow-citizens. But this recognition is closer to public honors than it seems; after athletes and the exceptional case of Harmodius and Aristogiton in Athens, the first citizens known to have received public rewards were those who had distinguished themselves for military prowess, and one of the first honors they received was, together with *sitêsis*, probably *proedria*.[143]

In short, Xenophanes and Tyrtaeus speak about communities in which the idea of public benefactions to citizens clearly exists. Not only services in defense of the polis but also contributions to its good governance and wealth were perceived as benefactions, and the citizens gave non-institutionalized rewards in response to some of these. Moreover, some voices even insinuate that such benefactions are worthy of official rewards like those victorious athletes received. In such an environment, some of the services and gifts elites provided to their communities must inevitably have been seen as benefactions. Later sources create the same impression. Pindar suggests that the victorious athlete is accepted in his community not only by presenting athletic triumph as a benefaction but also by describing the athlete as a public benefactor for other services as well, beginning with commissioning the *epinikion*.[144] *Pythian* 7 offers an interesting example of this type of "manipulation": it refers to the fame of the "citizens of Erechtheus" for having contributed to the restoration of the temple of Apollo at Delphi, thereby presenting the benefaction of the *genos* of the victorious athlete – the Alcmaeonidae – in the Panhellenic sanctuary as a benefaction to Athens because of the reputation it has brought the city.[145]

Institutional and non-institutional rewards

The gift and the hospitality meal with which the *oikos* welcomed its guests and with which the archaic polis received ambassadors from other communities[146] were a good platform for granting honors to foreigners.

[142] Although Maass 1972: 79 suggests the opposite.
[143] Harmodius and Aristogiton: Marm. Par. *FGrH* 239 A 54; Plin. *Nat.* 34. 17; *IG* I^3 131; Is. 5. 47; Din. 1. 101. Militares: *IG* I^3 131. Cf. Callinus fr. 1 West^2.
[144] Kurke 1991. [145] Pi. *P.* 7.
[146] Baslez 1984: 41–5; Wagner-Hasel 1998: 987. See also Chapter 5, Section 3.4.

That was also the case with the prize awarded to an athlete where the games took place in relation to the honors he received in his polis, which were essentially an extension of the prize. But there was nothing similar to serve as a foundation for honoring individuals who performed other benefactions. These circumstances are nonetheless insufficient to explain why citizens were not honored. The fact that the lack of honors for citizens coexisted for a long time with the habit of granting them to foreigners and athletes, together with the existence of a benefaction rhetoric (visible in inscriptions and in Pindar) used in the context of granting such honors that was hardly dissociable from descriptions of citizen benefactions (cf. Xenophanes), indicates that the step to honoring citizens might have been taken in the archaic age. The reasons for the absence of the practice must thus be more profound and related to fundamental aspects of the relationship between the elite and the rest of society.

The archaic age was a time of great tension between the elite and inferior levels of society, as a consequence of political and economic inequality.[147] The demos does not seem to have accepted the privileged position of the elite without reservation. Many gifts and services its members provided, despite being regarded as benefactions, must therefore simultaneously have been considered compensation offered to the demos by those who enjoyed more rights and advantages. In other words, these were seen as counter-gifts rather than as gifts, and there was consequently no need to reward them. Indeed, Walter Donlan shows that authors such as Archilochus, Tyrtaeus, Callinus, Xenophanes, Phocylides, and Solon reflect criticisms of aristocratic behavior felt by some sectors of the demos – Xenophanes, for instance, criticizes "useless luxury"– as well as pressure on the elite to be useful to the community.[148] The demos, or at least part of it, clearly believed that circumstances allowed them to ask members of the elite for a more substantial contribution to the community. In short, the elite owed services to the polis in which they lived.

There were surely some contributions whose magnitude meant that they were regarded as gifts (bearing in mind how blurred the boundaries between counter-gifts and gifts were, and how easy it was for the individual

[147] Austin and Vidal-Naquet 1972; Starr 1977; Pekáry 1979: 14–16, esp. 17; Snodgrass 1980: 143–5; Gehrke 1986: 38–40; Ober 1989: 55; Murray 1993: 38–54; van Wees 1999; V. Parker 2007; Gehrke 2009. We now have an entire monograph devoted to such tensions: Rose 2012 (see also Rose 2009: esp. 475–80). Among recent surveys on archaic history, Hall's is the most insistent on the antagonisms between the elite and the demos (Hall 2014: esp. 214–19, 256; cf. R. Osborne 2009: 176, 213).

[148] Donlan 1973; Xenoph. fr. 3 West^2. See also Wallace 2009: 411–13, 416.

who reciprocated to unbalance the relationship to his own advantage).[149] But in such cases, given the social tensions and the logic of non-rewarded benefactions discussed earlier, members of the elite were primarily interested in leaving the demos with a sense of indebtedness that would make it accept their position of privilege, rather than in receiving official rewards. The best counter-gift they could obtain was subordination. This type of exchange was in fact nothing more than a continuation in the polis of the relationship between the elite and the clients of their *oikoi*. The elite protected their clients and helped them with food, agricultural tools, and so on, for nothing in return or for minor services that did not pay off the debt, to keep them subordinated and available when needed for work or war.[150] When the elite became rulers of the polis, they regarded doing favors for the people in exchange for subordination as the obvious way of interacting with them.

Why then did the elite agree to be rewarded for athletic victories? In comparison with services such as financing festivals and public buildings, from which the demos clearly benefited, athletic victory was a service to the homeland in far more abstract terms and much less reminiscent of the favors granted to dependents of the *oikoi*. In addition, athletic victory was a problematic benefaction, being closely linked to individual success, which could arouse envy. And unlike benefactions that clearly represented an act of participation in the polis and solidarity with the rest of the community, athletic victory usually occurred far from home, at a festival that was above all else a gathering of members of the elite, which might lead to it being regarded as a manifestation of *hybris*. In the previous section, I argued that although athletic victories were perceived as a benefaction by most of the community, Pindar's poems suggest that some citizens did not consider them a good thing. Xenophanes too tried to minimize the importance of athletic victory, and in Chapter 3, I comment on similar criticisms of athletics advanced by intellectuals such as Euripides, Plato, and Aristotle. Paradoxically, therefore, athletes may have been honored largely because they could in this way be less easily perceived as benefactors. Just as some athletes made efforts through Pindar to convince the audience that they were benefactors, the social elite from which they came and which controlled the polis tried to use the granting of public honors to convince

[149] See Chapter 1, Section 2.1.

[150] See Millett 1989: 27. This way of relating to individuals of an inferior social station is characteristic of what anthropologists call "big men": van Wees 1998: 43. See also Stahl and Walter 2009: 145. On the origins of this relationship of dependence, see Morris 2007: 233, 235.

the rest of the community of the same. These honors served, however, not only to integrate the athlete into the community but also to bind the community itself together. Beyond the obvious fact that the integration of the athlete favored harmony within the group, the honors certified that the athlete's victory was a benefaction for the polis, so that the community tended to perceive his triumph as its own and to identify itself with him and his goals. Few things unite a group as much as the prospect of victory over another group or the experience of victory itself.

Given all this, the content and objective of Solon's legislation regarding athletics in Athens deserve analysis.[151] According to Plutarch and Diogenes Laertius:

> The victor at the Isthmian games was to be paid 100 drachmas, and at the Olympic ones 500.[152]
>
> [Solon] curtailed the honors of athletes who took part in games, fixing the allowance for an Olympic victor at 500 drachmae, for an Isthmian victor at 100 drachmae, and proportionately in all other cases. It was in bad taste, he urged, to increase the rewards of these victors, and to ignore the exclusive claims of those who had fallen in battle, whose sons ought, moreover, to be maintained and educated by the state.[153]

Diogenes Laertius not only specifies that the amounts to which Plutarch refers represented a reduction in relation to previous rewards but also maintains that Solon was motivated by a critical attitude toward athletes, which he explains later on.[154] Diodorus refers to the same attitude.[155] Some scholars consider this an anachronism reflecting the anti-athletic attitude of later authors, or a simple literary *topos* (intellectual criticism of the value of athletics).[156] But the fact is that, as noted, at around the time of Solon, Tyrtaeus too criticizes athletes, while Xenophanes, still in the archaic period, shows little sympathy for the fact that they receive more honors

[151] As noted earlier, there is no reason to believe that an ancient author invented this legislation. As Finley and Pleket (1976: 77) point out, "there must be a hard core of truth in the tradition."

[152] Plu. *Sol.* 23. 3. (tr. Perrin). As noted earlier, monetary units were already in use before coins reached Athens (von Reden 2010: 21). See also Mann 2001: 70–2; R. Osborne 2004: 18; van Wees 2009: 461. Cf. Fisher 2009: 530.

[153] D.L. 1. 55 (tr. Hicks).

[154] D.L. 1. 56: "Athletes, on the other hand, incur heavy costs while in training, do harm when successful, and are crowned for a victory over their country rather than over their rivals, and when they grow old they, in the words of Euripides, 'are worn threadbare, cloaks that have lost the nap,' and Solon, perceiving this, treated them with scant respect" (tr. Hicks).

[155] D.S. 9. 2. 5. "Solon believed that the boxers and short-distance runners and all other athletes contributed nothing worth mentioning to the safety of states, but that only men who excel in prudence and virtue are able to protect their native lands in times of danger" (tr. Oldfather).

[156] Kyle 1984: 95.

than the city's other benefactors.[157] If Diodorus and Diogenes are echoing Solon's actual attitude toward athletes, it is plausible that he did in fact restrict their rewards. However, Diogenes might have been led by Solon's generally negative attitude toward athletics to conclude that the reform consisted of a reduction of rewards, without relying on any earlier source; Plutarch, after all, does not speak of a reduction, which would seem likely to produce social conflict rather than relieve it. In that case, Solon perhaps did not reduce the amount of the rewards but merely fixed values that had previously varied (Xenophanes speaks only of an expensive "gift"). The clarity of criteria would have helped avoid conflict.

But even if Solon was the first to introduce cash rewards rather than simply regulating them, there is no need to conclude that he wanted to promote athletics.[158] Instead, he might have been aware of the capacity of honors for athletes to bind the community. Making the Athenian fragmented society more cohesive was Solon's main concern, and the more clearly linked the athlete's honors were to the polis, and thus the more obvious it was that an athletic victory was a benefaction to the polis, the greater the honors' bonding potential. For that purpose, the payment of cash by the polis must have been a highly effective measure. Alternatively, Solon might have established cash rewards to counterbalance the effects of "dangerous" honors that seemed "out of control," such as welcome receptions, *epinikia*, and statues, all of which probably existed in his time and might have paved an athlete's way to tyranny.[159] Such rewards presented the athlete as a hero, which was not the case with cash. Furthermore, the athlete might use rewards such as *epinikia* and statues – when he paid for them himself – to indebt the community by presenting the *epinikion* and the monument as the athlete's benefaction to the polis.[160] The fact that a generation before Solon, Cylon, an Olympic victor, had attempted to become tyrant[161] makes it plausible that Solon saw the need to introduce

[157] Tyrt. fr. 12 West²; Xenoph. fr. 2 West². Mann 2001: 74–6, shows the contradictions in the arguments defending the thesis that the information in Diodorus and Diogenes Laertius is anachronistic.

[158] Thus, for example, Gardiner 1910: 74; Hyde 1921: 32; Bowra 1938: 264; Pleket 1974: 62; D. Young 1984: 130–2; Weeber 1991: 81.

[159] The statue of Arrhachion in the agora in Phigalia was supposedly erected because of his Olympic victories between 572 BC and 564 BC (Paus. 8. 40. 1), and Cleombrotus erected a statue in Sybaris in the first half of the sixth century (Dubois 2002: no. 5). Ibycus fr. 282 B Campbell (*SLG* 220–6) seems to prove the existence of *epinikia* in the mid-sixth century, and *epinikia* were allegedly preceded by more primitive ways of praising athletes (Robbins 1997). On the other hand, there are hints of Solonian legislation against unruly *kômoi*: Murray 1990: 144; Fisher 2000: 93; Noussia-Fantuzzi 2010: 233.

[160] Kurke 1991.

[161] Hdt. 5. 70–1; Th. 1. 126; Plu. *Sol.* 12; Paus. 1. 28. 1.

a type of reward that would help neutralize the dangers of traditional honors. This can be connected with attitudes characteristic of the Athenians later on: the absence of *epinikia* composed by Pindar and Bacchylides for performance in Athens allows the hypothesis that *epinikia* were not highly regarded in Athens, while other data point to the fact that the Athenians found the erection of statues in honor of athletes problematic. I deal with these questions in detail in Chapter 3.

3 The tyrant's generosity

In the archaic polis, it was not just the elite but also tyrants who performed substantial benefactions – although the fact that tyrants arose from the elite means that it might be more accurate to say that alongside benefactions of "ordinary" members of the elite were benefactions of those who rose to become tyrants. The reasons that motivated tyrants to make benefactions and the compensations they received were also equal or similar to those awarded ordinary members of the elite, and the section that follows is accordingly to a considerable extent a reexamination of questions explored earlier. The differences between the situation and behavior of tyrants and those of other members of the elite are matters not of *essence* but of *dimension*: the tyrants' contributions were larger, their motivations more compelling, the counter-gifts they received more indispensable (to them), and – most important for our purposes – there is more information about their contributions in particular. Studying tyrants' benefactions is thus a way to comprehend more fully the benefactions of the elite.

3.1 Elite benefactions

Archaic tyranny is a controversial subject among scholars because although written sources are abundant, only scattered references in lyric poetry and a few inscriptions are contemporary.[162] Most of the evidence is instead from later times, when the political evolution of the polis produced a distorted view of archaic tyranny.[163] But recent work has produced solid conclusions about a number of matters relevant to this study. Archaic tyrants were not, as has often been asserted, revolutionary leaders of

[162] The word *tyrannis* and cognates are first attested at Archil. fr. 19.3 West², in an uninformative context. Alcaeus and Theognis are more useful; see R. Osborne 2009: 174–6.

[163] The process of democratization in the classical period promoted a negative assessment of tyranny, and the perpetuation of tyrannical regimes under new political conditions gave way to anachronistic conceptions. Cf. L. Mitchell 2013: 5–7, 153–6.

the demos who fought against the aristocracy,[164] but members of the elite who acted according to elitist laws and values.[165] Their lifestyle was aristocratic and was characterized by displays of luxury. Like other people of their social background, tyrants took care to maintain relationships with fellow members of the elite and with tyrants of other poleis, with whom they exchanged gifts and within whose circles they looked for spouses and friends.[166] They also used Panhellenic games to obtain fame beyond their poleis through offerings, banquets, construction projects, and their own athletic victories. Their political struggles against other members of the elite – not against the elite per se – were struggles for power and corresponded to an aristocratic ideal: that a man should strive to become the first and best.[167]

As in the case of contributions made by ordinary members of the elite, it is helpful when evaluating the role of tyrants as benefactors to take into account not just the concrete data about the contributions themselves but the circumstances that led these men to contribute to the polis. The tyrants' tendency to distance themselves symbolically from the demos was even greater than in the case of other representatives of the elite, since they were required to cooperate more closely with the demos. Tyrants accordingly tried to draw distinctions between themselves and others, for example, by presenting themselves as the descendants of heroes[168] or by making contributions to prove their social superiority. Behind their contributions to the financing of buildings and festivals and their other demonstrative expenditures was again the agonistic ethos, the aspiration to surpass other individuals of their class: the local elite, members of the elites of other poleis, whether tyrants or not, as well as their predecessors.[169] The Pisistratid system of water pipes and the

[164] Ure 1922; Cornelius 1929; Mossé 1969; Arnheim 1977: 121–3; Braccesi 1978; Oliva 1979: 226–36; de Ste. Croix 1981: 278–83.

[165] Stahl 1987: 258–60; Fatheuer 1988: 125–7; Brandt 1989: 217–19; Stein-Hölkeskamp 1989; Barceló 1993: 125–7; de Libero 1996; Stein-Hölkeskamp 1996: 653–5; Oliva 2000: 34–5; Osborne 2009: 180–5, 257; Stein-Hölkeskamp 2009: 106–7, 113; Luraghi 2013; Hall 2014: 144–53, 201.

[166] Periander of Corinth, for example, married the daughter of the tyrant Procles of Epidaurus, who was himself married to the daughter of an Arcadian king. On the marriage politics of tyrants, see Gernet 1968: 344–6; Stahl 1987: 94–5; Hall 2014: 149. During his second exile, Pisistratus received money from friends all over Greece (Hdt. 1. 61–4.; [Arist.] *Ath.* 15). Elite solidarity also functioned among tyrants, for example between Lygdamis of Naxos and Pisistratus, and between Pisistratus and Polycrates. On the exchange of gifts: Wagner-Hasel 2000: 316.

[167] Starr 1977: 180; Stahl 1987: 104; Brandt 1989: 218; Hall 2014: 147. Cf. L. Mitchell 2013: 61–5.

[168] Brandt 1989: 217–18; Hall 2014: 145.

[169] Brandt 1989: 218; de Libero 1996: 408–9; Stein-Hölkeskamp 2009.

Olympieium of Athens can be partially explained as an outcome of this type of rivalry.[170]

Archaic tyrants came from the upper layer of society, and the fact that their performance, including the exercise of power, was a coherent expression of aristocratic behavior does not imply that archaic tyranny was a phenomenon detached from the class conflicts of the age.[171] As Hans-Joachim Gehrke points out, the tyrants "were sons of this crisis, and without it – in their dimension as well as in the contents of their politics – not imaginable."[172] Since they had many enemies within their own social class, tyrants looked to the demos for the support without which many of them would have been unable to hold onto power.[173] Pisistratus helped humble peasants with loans and Aristodemus of Cyme promised to abolish debts and redistribute land.[174] The building programs of the tyrants were not "programs to create employment,"[175] since the objective was the buildings themselves, but tyrants used such programs to gain favor with the demos.[176] Passages in Herodotus and Aristotle imply that some tyrants were popular among the demos, and there is other evidence that these passages reflect the real situation in the archaic age.[177] Given the circumstances, it is unsurprising that tyrants became great benefactors of the demos.

If the demos was not prepared to accept the privileged position of the elite within the polis without a return, neither was it eager to accept the power of political usurpers and economic pillagers such as tyrants. In fact,

[170] The Pisistratid system of water pipes was an attempt to rival the water pipes of Samos (Kolb 1977: 110), and the Olympieium, other large-scale temples such as that of Hera on Samos (de Libero 1996: 408; Connelly 2014: 61).

[171] Thus, for example, Hopper 1961; Sealey 1976: 55–7.

[172] Gehrke 1986: 41 (my translation; original in German).

[173] We have data to this effect regarding Cypselus of Corinth (Arist. *Pol.* 1315^{b}27–8); Theagenes of Megara (Arist. *Pol.* 1305^{a} 25–6); Lygdamis of Naxos (Arist. *Pol.* 1305^{a}); Telys of Sybaris (D.S. 12. 9. 2–3.); Aristodemus of Cyme (D.H. *Ant. Rom.* 7. 3–11); Pisistratus (Hdt. 1. 59–60); Polycrates of Samos (deduced from Hdt. 3. 120; see Shipley 1987: 90); and Phoxus of Chalcis (Arist. *Pol.* 1304^{a} 29–31 although it is not clear that he dates to the archaic age: de Libero 1996: 233). After a period in which the main concern of scholars seemed to be stressing that tyranny was a product of intra-elite struggle, more recent work pays more attention to the complicity between tyrants and the demos: V. Parker 2007; Morris 2009: 75; Wallace 2009: 411–15; Rose 2012; Hall 2014: 3, 144–53.

[174] Pisistratus: [Arist.] *Ath.* 16. 2, 9; Ael. *VH* 9. 25. Aristodemus of Cyme: D.H. *Ant. Rom.* 7. 3–11 (he does not seem to have kept his promise: Brandt 1989: 216–17).

[175] This is the thesis advocated by scholars who regard tyrants as leaders of the demos (e.g., Ure 1922: 14–15, 62–3).

[176] Kolb 1977: 112; Stein-Hölkeskamp 2009: 113–14.

[177] Salmon 1997: 62–3 assembles these passages and analyzes the tensions between their positive image of the tyrants and the negative attitude of the authors toward tyrannical regimes. See also L. Mitchell 2013: 5–16.

many benefactions of tyrants must have had a compensation character, like some benefactions by the elite. And if the elite attempted to obtain subordination through substantial gifts, tyrants did so even more, because of the fragility of their position. From whatever perspective we look at the subject, therefore, benefactions – whether as gifts or counter-gifts – were even more important for tyrants than for the elite, and tyrants maintained a relationship of exchange with the demos in which official honors were likewise out of place.

Evidence of this is found in the poetry of Bacchylides and Pindar. Although these poets belong to the transition from the archaic to the classical period, and the Sicilian tyrannies to which they refer were different in some ways from those in the rest of the Greek world,[178] the model for negotiating a relationship with the demos through benefactions appears similar.[179] As Kurke observes, the poets treat victorious athletes in different ways, depending on whether they are simple members of the elite or tyrants. In the former case, the poets seem to moderate their references to *megaloprepeia* ("the lavish public expenditure of wealth by those who can afford it"), whereas with tyrants they insist far more on this quality.[180] A good example comes from Bacchylides' ode for Hieron of Syracuse:

> Ah, thrice fortunate man, who got from Zeus the privilege of ruling over the greatest number of Greeks and knows how not to hide his towering wealth in black-cloaked darkness. The temples abound in feasts where cattle are sacrificed, the streets abound in hospitality; and gold shines with flashing light from the high elaborate tripods standing in front of the temple where the Delphians tend the great sanctuary of Phoebus by the waters of Castalia.[181]

Kurke rightly points out that the difference of treatment is due to the fact that when a poet presents an athlete who is not a tyrant as a benefactor, he must be careful not to arouse the envy of fellow citizens or even the fear that the victor might attempt to become a tyrant (since *megaloprepeia* can be regarded as a stage previous to tyranny). In the case of tyrants, this restriction did not exist.[182] But the difference is also due to the fact that

[178] De Libero 1996: 18. Cf. Vlassopoulos 2007 on the importance of treating Sicilian tyrannies as part of archaic Greek history.

[179] Some statements by Kurke 1999: 131 might lead one to believe the opposite, but only because they reflect the perspective that Greek tyrants, in contrast to Sicilian tyrants, were "champions of the people."

[180] Kurke 1991: 167 (quotation), 170–2; Kurke 1999: 131.

[181] Bacch. 3. 10–21 (tr. Campbell).

[182] Kurke 1991: 181, 195–224, esp. 218–19, 224; Kurke 1999: 131.

when the honorand was a tyrant, the emphasis on munificence had to be stronger because of the type of exchange with the demos. For the same reasons, as well as the citizenry's wariness in the case of simple members of the elite, tyranny and *megaloprepeia* were closely linked.[183] Thus Pindar openly declares the generosity of Theron: "I will proclaim a statement on oath with a truthful mind, that no city within a century has produced a man more beneficent (*euergetês*) to his friends in spirit and more generous (*aphthonos*) of hand than Theron."[184] He similarly recommends that Hieron spare no expense if he wants to be esteemed: "Abide in flourishing high spirits, and if indeed you love always to hear pleasant things said about you, do not grow too tired of spending."[185] In line with these sentiments, poets highlight tyrants' wealth, which guarantees great works of munificence. Pindar asserts that "if anyone at this time claims that in point of wealth and honor any other man in Hellas from the past is your superior, with an empty mind he wrestles in vain," while Bacchylides tells Hieron, "of all men who dwell in Greece there is none, illustrious Hiero, who will be ready to claim that he sent more gold to Loxias than you."[186]

But the possibility that the tyrant's munificence was motivated to a considerable extent by a desire to satisfy the demos, and that it could be linked to a relationship of reciprocity, has barely been explored in most modern studies of archaic tyranny.[187] The most exhaustive survey of archaic tyranny insists that tyrants' benefactions must be considered aristocratic merely because they were a demonstration of luxury and a reflection of the agonistic principle.[188] This interpretation rests in part on the idea that any evidence that links tyrants with the demos lends support to the image of the tyrant as popular leader but also on the image of the elite as a selfish group largely unengaged with the rest of the community – a view discussed earlier (2.2.1). In fact, the way tyrants used munificence in interactions with the demos was entirely consistent with the behavior of the elite.

[183] There are several references to this association in later literature. The *Athenaion Politeia*, for example, reports that Cimon made benefactions because he had a fortune resembling that of a tyrant. See further Kurke 1991: 177–81.

[184] Pi. *O.* 2. 92–5 (tr. Race). According to Kloft 1970: 12, "friends" refers to "peers and political advisers," and "generous in hand" refers "primarily to the munificence toward individual fellow citizens" (my translation; original text in German).

[185] Pi. *P.* 1. 89–90 (tr. Race). Cf. X. *Hiero*. 8. 7.

[186] Pi. *P.* 2. 58–86 (tr. Race); Bacch. 3. 63–6 (tr. Campbell).

[187] This has begun to change in recent publications. Cf. Lavelle 2005; Domingo Gygax 2006a; V. Parker 2007; Hall 2014: 144–53.

[188] De Libero 1996.

3.2 *Tyrannical dimensions*

What were the differences between the tyrants and other members of the elite in terms of their contributions to the community? I have already noted that for tyrants, benefactions were far more necessary. But the main difference was *dimension*; not only the magnitude of the benefactions but also their number matters for evaluating tyrants' contributions.[189] The magnitude of tyrannical munificence must be in part a consequence of their greater need to obtain popular subordination, combined with the demos' more substantial demands. But other factors also influenced tyrants' actions. Their political rivals usually left the city or were expelled, so that a number of potential benefactors disappeared.[190] Members of the elite who remained in the polis rarely dared challenge the tyrant in the sphere of benefactions or elsewhere. Tyrants employed violence against individuals who stood out, and they probably tried to use political measures to keep others from excelling.[191] The tyrannical anti-luxury laws, if historical,[192] were not only populist measures but also a means to restrict competition from class peers.[193] In some poleis, in fact, demonstrative

[189] Scholars who believe that tyrannical munificence had aristocratic roots have tried to refute the notion that tyrants were superior benefactors. De Libero 1996: 408, for example, stresses that the buildings sponsored by tyrants were not larger than the ones paid for by aristocrats. She similarly attempts to show that many construction projects generally assigned to tyrants might not actually have been carried out by them.

[190] For example, in the cases of Lygdamis of Naxos (Arist. *Pol.* 1305^{a} 40–2; [Arist.] *Oec.* 1347^{b} 7–9), Telys of Sybaris (D.S. 12. 9. 2–3), Cypselus and Periander of Corinth (Hdt. 5. 92; Nicolaus of Damascus *FGrH* 90 F 57. 7; Plu. *Lys.* 1; Str. 8. 6. 20), Pisistratus (Hdt. 1. 64; 6. 103), Polycrates of Samos (Hdt. 3. 39; Polyaen. 1. 23), Aeaces of Samos (Hdt. 6. 22), Myrsilus of Mytilene (schol. Alc. fr. 114. 306 g 9–13; Alc. fr. 129. 67 Voigt), and Arcesilaus III of Cyrene (Hdt. 4. 164).

[191] Herodotus (5. 92) illustrates this with the following anecdote: Periander of Corinth sent a herald to Thrasybulus to get advice about how to rule his polis. Thrasybulus led the herald to a wheat field and cut down the tallest ears of wheat. The herald who relayed the message did not understand, but Periander did: He was to kill any citizens who stood out from the others. See also Arist. *Pol.* 1284^{a}26; 1311^{a}20–2; 1313^{a}40. To Solon it was obvious that tyranny was linked to violence: "If I have spared my country and not put my hand forth unto tyranny and relentless violence . . . I am not ashamed of it"; and further on: "nor did it please me to do anything tyrannous per force" (fr. 32 West^{2}, tr. Edmonds (32 and 34). Polycrates, Pantagnotus, and Syloson of Samos, for example, seem to have killed prominent individuals who might have proved dangerous to them (cf. Polyaen. 1. 23).

[192] We have information about anti-luxury laws of Periander of Corinth (Heraclides *FHG* ii. 213, fr. 5; Hdt. 5. 92; Ephorus *FGrH* 70 F 178 = D.L. 1. 96; Photius κ 1280); Pisistratus (Cic. *Leg.* 2. 64–5); and Pittacus of Mytilene (Cic. *Leg.* 2. 66). There are good arguments against the authenticity of Pisistratus' law (Kolb 1977: 136) but reason to believe that those of Periander (Salmon 1984: 197–205; Salmon 1997: 64–5) and Pittacus (Engels 1998: 50–1; Hölkeskamp 1999: 222) are authentic. On the authenticity, see also van Wees 2009: 462.

[193] The observations of Stein-Hölkeskamp (1989: 149) on the possible anti-luxury law of Pisistratus are applicable to other tyrants as well: "such a measure allowed him, above all, to present himself also at this level as someone pretty much unrivaled in glamor, wealth and superiority" (my translation; original text in German).

expenditures by elites probably diminished under tyrants. Thus on Naxos and Samos, statue dedications by the elite may have decreased markedly in the time of Lygdamis and Polycrates. (The same phenomenon has been assumed for Pisistratid Athens, but this case is more problematic.[194]) A pseudo-Aristotelian source even indicates that the dedication of statues was directly hindered by Lygdamis.[195] At other times, rather than completely repressing the inclination of the elite toward expenditure, the tyrant limited it so that it presented no competition to his own generosity, or so that by comparison it actually highlighted the splendor of his contributions. One likely example is a series of small sanctuaries in Corinth built in Periander's time.[196]

Another important factor is that tyrants normally had more means at their disposal for munificence than other members of the elite did. They came from extremely wealthy families, which partly explains their success. (Orthagoras of Sicyon might be an exception, but there are reasons to believe that the tradition about the Orthagorids' modest social origin is a fabrication.[197]) In addition, the sources contain several references to confiscations of their enemies' property by tyrants; the practice is explicitly attributed to Cypselus of Corinth, Lygdamis of Naxos, Telys of Sybaris, and Pythagoras of Ephesus and can be inferred in regard to Polycrates of Samos and Pisistratus.[198] Tyrants also obtained resources through military campaigns, plundering expeditions, and piracy.[199] According to Pausanias, Cleisthenes of Sicyon built a *stoa* in his polis with booty from the First Sacred War (*ca*. 590 BC).[200] The dedication of eight shields and a crown to Athena Lindia on behalf of Cleobulus of Lindus was also financed by war

[194] Naxos: von Steuben 1980: 29; Karakatsanis 1986: 177; Stewart 1990: 119; de Libero 1996: 239; Gruben 1997: 416. Samos: Freyer-Schauenburg 1974: 4–5; B. Mitchell 1975: 84–5; Shipley 1987: 84; Stewart 1990: 126; de Libero 1996: 271–2; Carty 2015: 205–6. Athens: Raubitschek 1949: 455–7; Richter 1960: 114. Cf. Keesling 2003: 39–42, who is also skeptical about the interpretations of the cases of Naxos and Samos (but see Scholl 2006: 132).

[195] [Arist.] *Oec*. 1346^{b}9–12: Lygdamis sold statues belonging to individuals in exile that were intended for temples but were still in the workshops.

[196] Salmon 1984: 78, 201; de Libero 1996: 171; Stein-Hölkeskamp 2009: 104.

[197] Cf. Solon on the relationship of tyrannical power to wealth: "if only I might first obtain wealth abundant and be tyrant of Athens for a single day" (fr. 33.5–6 West^{2}; tr. based on Edmonds 32). See Noussia-Fantuzzi 2010: 440–2. On the Orthagorids, Hall 2014: 145.

[198] Hdt. 5. 92 and Nicolaus of Damascus *FGrH* 90 F 57. 7 (Cypselus); [Arist.] *Oec*. 1346^{b}7–9 (Lygdamis); D.S. 12. 9. 2 ff. (Telys); Baton of Sinope *FGrH* 268 F 3 (Pythagoras). On Polycrates of Samos, Brandt 1989: 213; on Pisistratus, Berve 1967: vol. 1, 53, vol. 2, 548; Seibert 1979: 15; Chambers 1984: 70; V. Parker 2007: 30 (cf. Lavelle 2005: 151–2). According to Brandt 1989: 214, "the expropriation of rivals is always a constitutive element in establishing a tyranny" (my translation; original text in German). See also van Wees 2013: 29–30.

[199] De Libero 1996: 404.

[200] Paus. 2. 9. 6. On the location of the *stoa*, see Griffin 1982: 97.

booty, according to the Lindian Chronicle.[201] Unsurprisingly, by Plato's time the wealth of Polycrates had become a topos to refer to an enormous fortune, while Ps.-Aristotle says that Cimon "possessed a tyrannical fortune."[202] The *Nicomachean Ethics* also echoes the tyrants' reputation for extraordinary wealth, stressing that it enabled them to make presents and absorb enormous expenses: "The one who spends beyond his means is 'profligate.' Therefore we do not call tyrants profligates, for it does not seem to be easy for them to spend beyond their means for gifts and expenses."[203] But the tyrants' superior resources not only allowed them to spend more than others but *obliged* them to do so, on the principle that every man had to contribute to the community according to his abilities. Brian Lavelle has analyzed the relationship between wealth and the tyranny of the Pisitratidae and concludes that "Peisistratos' final tyranny depended on his ability to locate and exploit ongoing sources of wealth with which to enrich the Athenians over time" and that "it was this partnership between the demos and him (and then his successors), really an economic and political symbiosis, that kept the tyranny going." Hippias would have failed to maintain his popularity among the Athenians in part because he was unable to secure the same resources.[204]

The fact that the tyrant found less competition for his generosity within the polis than an elite member in a polis without a tyrant did not lead to a reduction of the tyrant's contributions. Apart from having to confront the competition of tyrants and rich individuals from other poleis, the elimination of competitors in his own polis may have forced him to take on expenses that in other poleis were more widely distributed among the elite.[205] If his resources (or his generosity) were insufficient, the tyrant could (like the Pisistratidae) collect taxes[206] or (as the Pisistratidae may have done as well) require wealthy individuals to perform liturgies.[207] Obligatory liturgies – and taxes, of course – were controlled contributions that could be organized in ways that did not eclipse the tyrant's own

[201] *FGrH* 532 C 23. [202] Pl. *Men*. 90a; [Arist.] *Ath*. 27. 3.
[203] Arist. *NE* 1120^{b}24–7 (tr. Kurke). [204] Lavelle 2005: 159.
[205] This does not exclude the possibility of collaboration between the tyrant and the elite; see Osborne 2009: 261, on Polycrates. On tyrant/elite collaboration in general, see Forsdyke 2005: 64–7.
[206] Hdt. 1. 64; Th. 6. 54. 5; [Arist.] *Ath*. 16. 4; *App. Prov*. 2. 66; D.S. 9. 37; D.L. 1. 53; Zenob. 4. 76; *Suda* σ 1711. But this was unusual and seems not to have happened until the sixth century (de Libero 1996: 404). The information on taxes imposed by Cypselus at [Arist.] *Oec*. 1346^{a} 32–1346^{b}2; is unreliable (de Libero 1996: 145), and the insistence by Berve 1967: vol. 2, 579, that Aristagoras and Histiaeus collected taxes finds no support in the sources (de Libero 1996: 360). On the Pisistratidae, see van Wees 2013: 84–5: taxes were levied only when necessary and only from the estates of the wealthy.
[207] [Arist.] *Oec*. 1347^{a}11–14. That does not mean that obligatory liturgies were invented by the Pisistratidae (cf. D. 42. 1).

munificence. In fact, already in ancient times it may not always have been easy to distinguish between the personal contribution of the tyrant and the contributions of others thanks to the tyrant's intervention. What mattered in any event was the tyrant's capacity to mobilize resources and his ability to take credit for the enterprise. That in the literary tradition so many temples are linked to tyrants seems to be a consequence of this fact and not merely a result of the previously mentioned tendency of ancient historians to connect important construction projects to important names.[208] If a tyrant had to contribute in several areas, his contributions were perhaps not always impressive. But examples of outstanding contributions are not lacking. In addition to the Olympieium of the Pisistratidae, "the largest temple ever built in the Peloponnese" was probably built by Periander, while Polycrates' construction projects on Samos remained famous in Herodotus' time.[209] Other literary sources, inscriptions, and archaeological material connect specific building projects to tyrants, and this information produces a clear image of their contribution in this area, provided we accept that (a) in a polis controlled by a tyrant, the tyrant tended to monopolize munificence, and as a general rule the initiative in building projects accordingly belonged to him rather than to other members of the elite; and (b) construction carried out by a tyrant was usually financed in such a way that it allowed him to capitalize on the success of the undertaking.

I begin with the Pisistratidae. Several monuments have traditionally been attributed to the Pisistratidae, although in the past two decades there has been a tendency to down-date them, first from the time of Pisistratus to the regime of his sons, and then from this period to the Cleisthenic one.[210] As Jonathan Hall has noted, this tendency "raises awkward historical problems," since on the one hand "it compresses a flurry of frenetic building activity into an extremely narrow chronological 'window'" and on the other hand "it leaves us wondering exactly what it was that the Pisistratidae did during their thirty-six years of uninterrupted power."[211] Actually, some studies support Hall's view. The dating of the Old Temple of Athena Polias to 510–500 BC has been challenged;[212] a return to Wilhelm Dörpfeld's theory, according to which the so-called

[208] See Hall 2014: 88, 253–4. [209] Salmon 1997: 66 (quotation); Hdt. 3. 60 (Polycrates).
[210] Childs 1994; Korres 1997: 38–9; Hurwitt 1999; Stewart 2012; Connelly 2014: 45–75.
[211] Hall 2014: 253. He develops this argument in Hall 2007a: 339–42. See also Rose 2012: 236–7 and Paleothodoros 2012: 51.
[212] Holtzmann 2003: 78–9; Franciosi 2010: 141–2; Santi 2010; *contra*: Stewart 2012; Hurwitt 2013; and Jacob 2014: 177–9.

H-architecture of the first half of the sixth century would belong to the Old Temple of Athena Polias, has also been proposed.[213] The main advocate of this thesis, Manolis Kissas, suggests that the temple was built by Pisistratus (or Solon) and later renovated or replaced by a new temple by his sons (or the Cleisthenic regime).[214] But even if one does not accept these interpretations and believes that the Old Temple of Athena Polias was built in 510–500 BC, while the H-architecture belongs to a separate temple located on the site of the future Parthenon, it is hard to imagine that the Pisistratidae were not involved in significant building activity on the acropolis. [215]

Pisistratus also seems to have been responsible for the creation of a sacred precinct of Artemis Brauronia on the acropolis and for the construction of a temple in the sanctuary of Artemis at Brauron.[216] Under him and his sons, several new structures appeared, some of them quite sumptuous: an aqueduct from Mount Lycabettus to the agora, the Enneacrunus fountain house, the altar of the Twelve Gods, the Olympieium (not finished until the reign of Hadrian) and an adjacent courtyard, an altar in the sanctuary of Apollo Pythius by the Ilissus, and the sanctuary of Dionysus Eleuthereus on the south slope of the acropolis.[217] The laying out of the agora as a public space is regarded as a work of the Pisistratidae, and Thucydides says that they "splendidly adorned their city."[218]

[213] Kissas 2008: 99–112; followed by Stewart 2012 (*contra* Santi 2009; Santi 2010; Hurwitt 2013; Connelly 2014: 53–75). For the state of the question, see Holtzmann 2012.

[214] Kissas 2008: 106, 108, 110.

[215] Connelly 2014: 60–2. See also Boersma 2000: 52–4: Although he tries to demonstrate that the Pisistratidae had little impact on the building policy of Athens (cf. Blok 2000: 21–2 in the same volume), he believes that after 528 BC, they rebuilt and redecorated the temple of Athena Polias to compete with the building projects of other tyrants.

[216] Photius β 264; de Libero 1996: 97–9; Holtzmann 2003: 180–1; Lavelle 2005: 22; Schoch 2009: 239–40; Franciosi 2010; Hall 2014: 253. The foundation of the *temenos* of Athena Nike on the acropolis has also been attributed to him (Stahl 1987: 245; Shapiro 1989: 24; Camp 2001: 31), but this seems more problematic (Scholl 2006: 37–41).

[217] On the Enneacrounus spring: Th. 2. 15. 5; Paus. 1. 14. 1. The altar of the Twelve Gods: Hdt. 6. 108. 4; Th. 6. 54. 6–7; Gadbery 1992; Camp 2001: 32–5. The Olympieium: Arist. *Pol.* 1313^{b}23; Tölle-Kastenbein 1994. The altar of Apollo Pythios: *IG* I^{3} 948; Th. 6. 54. 6–7; Paus. 1. 19; cf. Petrovic 2007: 260–6. 1. The Dionysus Eleuthereus sanctuary: Paus. 1. 20. 3; Hurwit 1999: 117; Paleothodoros 2012: 56; Connelly 2014: 61. On the buildings of the Pisistratidae in general, see Kolb 1977; de Libero 1996: 94–107; Camp 2001: 31–9; Osborne 2009: 269; Connelly 2014: 60–3. The conclusion of Stahl and Walter 2009: 151 is that "the Peisistratids undertook extraordinary efforts to build up Athens as a city, especially by enhancing the large sanctuary of Athena on the Acropolis with numerous temples and shrines."

[218] Camp 1986; Hurwit 1999: 120–1; Connelly 2014: 61. Th. 6. 54. 5.

Extensive building activity has also been attributed to Polycrates of Samos, including the monumental temple of Hera in the Heraeum in the southwest of the city, several minor structures in the same sanctuary,[219] impressive fortifications, an aqueduct cut through the mountain (the so-called Eupalinus tunnel), a harbor mole, and a bazaar of some sort (the Laura).[220] Aristotle must have being thinking of these projects when he mentioned among the tyrants' most significant construction projects "the Polycratean works (*erga*)."[221] Although some of these projects may have started before he became tyrant,[222] archaeological dating places the majority of them in a time that overlaps with his rule, and even scholars who attempt to minimize Polycrates' role as builder recognize that projects such as the temple of Hera must be due to a great extent to his intervention.[223] The tyrants who succeeded Polycrates on Samos also seem to have contributed to these works; according to Herodotus, Maeandrus had an altar and a *temenos* built for Zeus Eleutherius.[224] Among the tyrants' projects, Aristotle also highlights the *anathêmata* (dedications) of the Cypselids of Corinth.[225] Cypselus' contribution to the erection of the temple of Apollo at Corinth is controversial – it might have been built before his reign – but we can infer from our sources that he had a hand in the construction of the city walls and the temple of Poseidon at the Isthmus, and that Periander played a part in the construction of the great temple for Zeus Olympius, the Peirene and Glauce fountains, the sanctuary of Demeter and Core at Acrocorinth, a harbor at Lechaeum and the *diolkos*, a paved road across the Isthmus.[226]

[219] A monopteros and the south building, the north hall, the north door, the north building and temples A, B, C, and D. See H. Kienast 1992; de Libero 1996: 290–2; H. Kienast 2002.

[220] The temple of Hera: Hdt. 3. 60; Kyrieleis 1981; H. Kienast 2002; H. Kienast 2004b; Carty 2015: 92–3. The fortifications: Hdt. 3. 39; H. Kienast 1978. The Eupalinus-tunnel: Hdt. 3. 60; H. Kienast 2004a. The harbor mole: Hdt. 3. 60; Tölle-Kastenbein 1976: 72–4. The Laura: Clearchus of Soli fr. 44 Wehrli. On Polycrates' building projects in general, see Stein-Hölkeskamp 2009: 109–10.

[221] Arist. *Pol.* 1313^{b}22.

[222] This is highly probable in the case of the Eupalinus tunnel: H. Kienast 2004a; Carty 2015: 31, 221.

[223] De Libero 1996: 290; Stein-Hölkeskamp 2009: 109–10; Carty 2015: 92–3, 206–7.

[224] Hdt. 3. 142. De Libero 1996: 287–9, 309–10.

[225] *Pol.* 1313^{b}22.

[226] Although none of these structures is attributed to the Cypselids by written sources, the combination of archaeological information with sources that refer to Cypselid construction activity at Delphi (the treasure house of the Corinthians: Hdt. 1. 14; Plu. *Mor.* 164a; 400d–f; 724b; Paus. 10. 13. 5) and dedications such as a statue of Zeus at Olympia (Agaclytus *FGrH* 411 F 1; Str. 8. 3. 30; 6. 20; Plu. *Mor.* 400e; Paus. 5. 2. 3; Apellas *FGrH* 266 F 5), put Cypselid involvement in at least some of these projects beyond doubt. See Salmon 1984: 59–61, 133–4, 201–2, 220–1, 228; de Libero 1996: 170–3; Salmon 1997: 66; Bookidis and Stroud 2004; Kreutz 2007: 78; Stein-Hölkeskamp 2009: 104; Pettegrew 2011; Haarer 2013; Tasinos 2013; Hall 2014: 148.

Written sources inform us about building projects by other tyrants. In addition to the *stoa* mentioned earlier, a *temenos* and a temple of Heros Melanippus, a racetrack and a *palaestra* (all by Cleisthenes of Sicyon),[227] we know of an altar for the god of the Achelous River and a sumptuous fountain (by Theagenes of Megara),[228] a temple for Athena Lindia (renewed by Cleobulus of Lindus),[229] a temple for an unknown deity (by Pythagoras of Ephesus),[230] and temples in Syracuse, Himera, and next to Mount Etna (embellished or built by Gelon).[231] Archaeological dating, meanwhile, allows the temple of Apollo at Palati and the temple of Sagri to be assigned to Lygdamis of Naxos.[232] (The monumental Heraeum of Argos has been attributed to Pheidon, but the dates of his reign are problematic.[233]) For the engagement of tyrants in festival celebrations, we are limited to written sources. But Thucydides and Ps.-Aristotle describe the role the Pisistratidae played in the Panathenaic procession,[234] which suggests that they made a notable contribution to these events in an attempt to show their superiority. One source even credits Pisistratus with enlarging the Panathenaea to include athletic and musical competitions, although the accuracy of this information is uncertain.[235] Cleisthenes of Sicyon instituted the Pythian games with

[227] The *stoa*: Paus. 2. 9. 6. The *temenos* and temple: Hdt. 5. 67. The racetrack and *palaestra*: Hdt. 6. 126, 128. See Griffin 1982: 96; Lolos 2011: 51–2, 64, 272–4. None of these structures is archaeologically documented. Griffin 1982: 97 argues that the *stoa* must have been located where the Hellenistic agora was built, and Lolos 2011: 31–2, thinks that the construction of the harbors may well also go back to the tyrannic period.

[228] Paus. 1. 40. 1, 41. 2. See Berve 1967: vol. 2. 536; de Libero 1996: 229; Larson 2001: 146–7.

[229] D.L. 1. 89. The archaic temple destroyed in the fourth century has been dated to the sixth (the time of Cleobulus) on the basis of the floor plan of a subsequent building (Dyggve 1960: 114, 126–8; Sonnabend 1999: 240; Schoch 2009: 228–30).

[230] Baton of Sinope *FGrH* 268 F 3. There are two possibilities: the so-called Temple C or the Hekatompedos (de Libero 1996: 368–70; Schoch 2009: 233; Kerschner and Prochaska 2011).

[231] D.S. 11. 25. 1 and 26. 7. On the literary sources and archaeological remains, see Luraghi 1994: 319–20; Faraguna 1999: 576; K. Morgan 2015: 46–52.

[232] Gruben 1982: 165; Kaletsch 1989: 462; Gruben 1997: 416; Gruben 2001: 374–5; Pedley 2012: 156.

[233] Gehrke 1986: 114; Gehrke 1990: 41. The dates proposed for Pheidon's reign range from the eighth century to the early sixth century (cf. Wolff 2010: 142; Kõiv 2013).

[234] They chose the participants, decided the order of the groups, and sent or received the procession (Th. 6. 56–8; [Arist.] *Ath.* 18. 2–3).

[235] Schol. Aristid. *Panath.* 189, Dindorf III 323 = Arist. fr. 637 Rose. The authenticity of this information – which contradicts the pre-Pisistratid date (566/5 BC) for the introduction of the competitions assumed by Euseb. Ol. 53. 3. p. $102^{b}4$–5 and Marcellinus, *Vit. Thuc.* 3 = Pherecydes *FGrH* 3 F 2 – is accepted by T. L. Shear 1978b: 3; Stahl 1987: 246–8; Stein-Hölkeskamp 1989: 150; Kotsidu 1991: 173; B. Zimmermann 2008: 92, but not by Kolb 1977: 113, 133; R. Parker 1996: 89; de Libero 1996: 108–9; Neils 2007. Cf. Hall 2014: 254–5 and Hall 2007a: 339: "little effort has been expended in explaining how Eusebius, writing in the early fourth century CE, arrived at his date or in asking whether the introduction of games in the 560s . . . necessarily excludes later Pisistratid involvement."

booty from the war against Crisa.[236] According to Herodotus, he also reassigned the festivals and the sacrifice for Adrastus to the cult of Melanippus (which he organized), and the tragic representations in honor of Adrastus to Dionysus.[237] Archinus of Argos founded the agon of the Hecatombaea and donated weapons for prizes. Amphitres of Miletus seems to have led a polis procession in the manner of the Pisistratidae.[238] Tyrants also helped individuals within the polis. Polycrates, for example, supported the relatives of those who had fallen in battle,[239] while Pisistratus was credited with subsidizing those disabled in war and also, as mentioned, with making loans to poor peasants. Evidently, this was a way not just to obtain partisans but also to show a willingness to perform services for the community.[240]

3.3 The "big man" metaphor

It has been suggested that the archaic tyrant represents a "return of the big man,"[241] a view that partly overlaps with the thesis linking tyrants to an attempt to recuperate the figure of the *basileus*.[242] Introducing the concept of "big man" in the discussion of archaic tyranny is worthwhile. A comparison between this anthropological construct – often used by archaeologists and historians of the Greek Dark Age and the Homeric world – and the evidence for archaic tyranny, serves to challenge the historiography that depicts tyrants as selfish aristocrats, draws attention to the munificence of tyrants, helps explain them not as aristocrats but just as members of the elite, and underlines the importance of relationships of reciprocity. All this does not mean, however, that the emergence of tyrants should be described as literally a "return of the big man."

"Big man" derives from "bikpela man" in Tok Pisin (a Melanesian language) and was used as *terminus technicus* already in the Melanesian

[236] Schol. Pi. *N*. 9. See Hubbard 1992: 82–4; Fisher 2010: 86–7. The earliest inscription referring to a victory in these games is *SEG* XI 257 (*ca*. 475 BC).
[237] Hdt. 5. 67. Hubbard 1992: 83–4; Stein-Hölkeskamp 2009: 105; Fisher 2010: 84–6.
[238] Archinus: schol. Pi. *O*. 7. 152d. Amphitres: Nicolaus of Damascus *FGrH* 90 F 52; Conon *FGrH* 26 F 1; 44. A tyrant of Cephallenia, by contrast, is said to have reduced the community's festivals (Heraclides *FHG* ii. 222, fr. 32. 1), which must be interpreted as an exception or even an invention of fourth-century historiography attempting to transmit a despotic image of the tyrant.
[239] Duris *FGrH* 76 F 63 reports that Polycrates forced wealthy individuals to provide this help. But this version of the story seems to have been influenced by the institutionalized assistance of later times, and the assistance in question was probably provided by Polycrates himself (de Libero 1996: 272–3; Carty 2015: 198–9).
[240] [Arist.] *Ath*. 16. 2, 9; Ael. *VH* 9. 25; Plu. *Sol*. 31. 2. See van Wees 2013: 81.
[241] Hall 2014: 144.
[242] Parker 2007.

ethnography of the 1950s. Thanks to an influential 1963 essay by Marshall Sahlins and later contributions by anthropologists such as Maurice Godelier, the term has become a label for an anthropological ideal type characterized by a collection of attributes:[243]

- The big man is a male leader whose position of political influence is not inherited and does not originate from appointment to an office.
- The position is attained through public oratory and private persuasion.
- It is also achieved by means of skillful management of both private and public wealth. Someone grows into a big man thanks to his capacity to produce or collect wealth and to redistribute it with strategic generosity. He combines an apparent interest in the general welfare with self-interest and economic calculation.
- The big man's power is primarily based on the application of the principle of reciprocity. He becomes and remains influential with his followers by engaging in ongoing unbalanced reciprocal exchange with individuals who become his debtors.
- The group of followers over which he has direct influence is small (not more than a few hundred).
- His influence beyond the small group is based on his prestige and cooperation with other big men, who, however, are also in competition with him.
- His coercive power in mobilizing wealth for public gifts is limited.
- His personal power is precarious. He runs the risk of losing supporters in favor of more efficient rivals.
- His status cannot be transmitted.
- He is a mark of a stage in the process of social development leading to the formation of chiefdoms and more complex societies.
- The main difference between the big man and the "chief" (an ideal type in contrast to which the big man is frequently defined) lies in the achieved status of the big man versus the ascribed status of the chief.

No "real entity," of course, satisfies all the characteristic of an ideal type. But how close is the tyrant to the big man? There are obvious similarities: both have an achieved status and base their power heavily on uneven exchange. Their image is that of someone concerned with the common good; their priority, however, is personal power. Their situation is unstable and their position hardly transferable. But there are also important

[243] The list that follows is based on Sahlins 1963; Godelier 1986: 147–56; Godelier 1991; Laburthe-Tolra and Warnier 1993: 121–2, 142; Terrell 1997; Lederman 2001; Lindstrom 2010.

differences. A substantial part of the tyrant's power lies in his military strength. Coercion is a significant element of his strategy of domination and access to wealth. Public oratory, by contrast, is not one of his main sources of influence. The power gap between him and the other members of the elite is greater than the one between the big man and those competing to displace him. (The tyrant is a "huge man," not just a big man.) He exercises direct authority over a much larger group and has less need to ally himself with individuals of high status. He is more concerned with the support of average people than with the backing of peers. The community he leads is more complex and features state institutions. While the big man represents a stage in the evolution to the chiefdom (in which the leader's power derives from an ascribed status), the tyrant appears after the *basileus*, who already has features of a chief.[244] Despite the relative instability of his power and the difficulty of transmitting his status, we do not lack examples of families with more than one generation of tyrants, for example, the Cypselids of Corinth, the Orthagorids of Sicyon, and the Pisistratidae of Athens.

Because the big man is characterized mainly by his generosity, the return of the big man seems to evoke an intermediate stage of "selfish aristocrats" between the period of the big men and the tyrants. As we have seen, however, the archaic elites were also generous and engaged in the same relations of reciprocity with the demos as tyrants did. In some ways, they had more of the character of big men than tyrants did, because their power was based less on coercion and more on collaboration with peers. The tyrant does not recuperate a practice of the Homeric *basileis* by exercising munificence but simply acts as a member of the elite of his time. Moreover, he also behaves similarly to the members of the elites of later times. Some of them may actually more closely resemble big men (the ideal type, not the big man understood as a synonym of *basileus*) than tyrants themselves, because they combine largesse with rhetorical persuasion.[245] This will become clear in the chapters that follow, when I discuss figures such as Cimon of Athens. One problem of applying the term "big man" to tyrants is precisely that linking the tyrant with the Dark Age and the Homeric world makes recognition of these continuities more difficult.

The similarities between archaic tyrants and later elites go beyond the classical period and connect them with figures very distant from big men.

[244] Donlan 1982/82; Donlan 1997; Hall 2014: 127–34.
[245] On the importance of oratory already in fifth-century Athenian politics, see Mann 2007.

The munificence of tyrants bears a resemblance to that of Hellenistic kings: unlike the generosity of big men, it stood out in comparison to the munificence of the rest of the elite and represents an attempt to encourage the acceptance of autocratic power. In fact, archaic society was closer to the euergetic landscape of the Hellenistic period than chronological distance might at first invite us to believe. An elite with an agonistic mentality and a desire to symbolically express its superiority was already devoting a great deal of time and private resources to the polis. Gifts regarded as benefactions were being made and compensated with political support, with members of the elite formally recompensed for their athletic achievements, and foreigners awarded characteristic euergetic honors. But the road to full euergetism was long. The next three chapters argue that democratic Athens delayed this development, while also making it possible.

CHAPTER 3

Continuity and change (1): foreigners and athletes

In the early classical period, Greek poleis continued granting honors to foreign benefactors and to citizens who brought their city glory through victory in Panhellenic games, but the circle of citizens recognized as *euergetai* gradually expanded. In Athens in particular, honors were increasingly awarded to citizens other than athletes, primarily for military and political services. The dominant democratic ideology of the polis did not allow for official recognition of many benefactions, and some of the informal counter-gifts the community offered in exchange for such benefactions differed from those of the archaic age. The fact that almost all our data for this period come from Athens is less of a problem than it might be, since Athens was the place of origin of the practice, which eventually spread throughout the Greek world, of systematically honoring members of the polis elite for their services and economic contributions. This custom arose in Athens first because of circumstances that did not prevail in other poleis: the possession of a naval empire, an enormous economic and military effort during the Peloponnesian War, and the existence of a "radical" democracy. Although other fifth-century poleis granted honors to their citizens, they never developed the practice as extensively as Athens did, either because they were controlled by tyrannical or oligarchic regimes – meaning that the relationship of elites to the demos was similar to that in the archaic poleis, and thus that the same obstacles to the development of an euergetism of citizens prevailed – or they were democratic, but the economic and military conditions were different from those in Athens.

I argue that the consolidation of the polis system and the democratic regime enhanced a sense of community, which brought with it pressure to perform services for the common good. The democratic system also produced a need for members of the elite with political ambitions to gain popular support, and benefactions accordingly became an important political instrument. But the same system empowered a demos that was reluctant to recognize any economic dependence on the elite or to

institutionalize a superior category of citizens – the *euergetai* – by publicly rewarding benefactions. As a result, in the early classical period most benefactions by individuals seeking political support were made in the context of liturgies, obligatory services that were not official benefactions and thus did not need to be rewarded with honors. Before we deal with this type of contribution in Chapter 4, however, let us examine the benefactions of foreigners and athletes.

1 Polis and foreigners

In Chapter 2, Section 1.1, I noted three foreigners honored as *euergetai* in the fifth century: Dionysius, Aristoteles son of Chelonius, and Alexander I, who received honors from Gortyn, Eretria, and Athens, respectively.[1] All three men were honored at the beginning of the century, a period for which we have little documentation, but more information becomes available as time passes. I begin with some examples from outside Athens, where the evidence is scarcer and more isolated:[2]

- A famous case is Themistocles, to whom Corcyra granted the title *euergetês*. Thucydides, who refers to the honor, does not explain the reasons for it, but Plutarch suggests that it was because of Themistocles' services as arbiter in a dispute between Corcyra and Corinth over control of Leucas. If so, the honor must have been granted before 480 BC.[3]
- Around 480–470 BC or 450 BC, the Cyprian town of Idalion solemnly rewarded the physician Onasilus and his brothers with land for having treated the wounded without fee during a long siege.[4]
- About 450 BC, the polis of Thetonium awarded an anonymous Corinthian *asylia, ateleia*, and the title *euergetês* to thank him for having saved the treasures of a sanctuary.

[1] *I. Cret*. IV 64 = *Nomima* I 8 (Dionysius); *IG* XII Suppl. 549 = *Nomima* I 39 (Aristotle); Hdt. 8. 136 (Alexander I).

[2] As Gauthier 1985: 131, points out, "the documentation rarely permits us to go back beyond the fourth century" (original in French). Although he mentions no examples, however, he believes that there were foreign benefactors in most cities. The examples cited earlier and following confirm this thesis.

[3] Th. 1. 136; Plu. *Them*. 24. On the date, see Marr 1998: 138. Frost 1998: 181 suggests an even earlier *terminus ante quem*: "before the Persian Wars." The scholiast to Thucydides claims that Themistocles was acclaimed *euergetês* for other reasons, among them that he prevented the allies from destroying Corcyra for its attitude during the Persian invasion. This seems implausible (Frost 1998: 180; Marr 1998: 139; Keaveney 2003: 12–13), which does not mean that Plutarch's version (accepted by Frost 1998: 180; Keaveney 2003: 13) is unproblematic (Marr 1998: 139).

[4] Masson 1983: 236–44 = *Nomima* I 33. Most scholars date this reward to 480–470 BC, but Egetmeyer 2010: 629, proposes 450. On the reward, see Piñol Villanueva 2013: 129–30.

- According to Xenophon, at the beginning of the fourth century, Polydamas of Pharsalos boasted that all his predecessors as far back as he could recall had been *proxenoi* and *euergetai* of Sparta. These honors must thus have gone back at least to Polydamas' grandfather in the mid-fifth century.
- At the end of the century, Eretria rewarded Hegelochus of Tarentum with the titles *proxenos* and *euergetês*, as well as with *sitêsis, ateleia*, and *proedria*.
- In a decree from Alea (in Arcadia), the titles of *proxenos* and *euergetês* were granted to Diphilus of Athens.
- Finally, Thucydides says that Alcibiades took care of Spartan prisoners with an eye to receiving a proxeny.[5]

We also have information about other *proxenos* titles for which the cause of the award is obscure. If my analysis in Chapter 1, Section 3.2, of what granting the proxeny meant is correct, these cases are further evidence of euergetic rewards.[6]

Some poleis kept lists of foreigners awarded the titles *euergetês* and *proxenos*. Although most of the evidence is from later periods, the custom must have been widespread in the fifth century, given the way Herodotus and Thucydides speak of a similar habit attributed to the Persian kings. Their use of *anagraphein* and *euergetês* reflects the fact that they understood it through the Greek practice.[7]

1.1 Proxenia *and* euergesia

As noted, most of our information about rewards for foreigners comes from Athens, and detailed study of this evidence reveals the extent to which the habit was more developed than that of honoring citizens. The sources – largely inscriptions – describe the granting of various honors and combinations of

[5] *IG* IX, 2, 257 = *Nomima* I 33 (Thetonium); X. *HG* 6. 1. 4 and Wallace 1970: 198 (Polydamas); *IG* XII, 9, 187 A = Meiggs–Lewis 82 (Hegelochus, cf. Knoepfler 2001: 77–84); Michel, *Recueil* 188 (Alea); Th. 5. 43. 2 (Alcibiades). There is another proxeny decree on the stele of the decree for Hegelochus (see *Syll.*^{3}106), but it probably belongs to the fourth century (Knoepfler 2001: 84–8).

[6] *SEG* XIII 239 = *Nomima* I 35 (Argos, 475–470), *IG* IX, 1^{2}, 717 (Oeanthea, 450–425; cf. Jeffery 1990^{2}: 106, 108, no. 4); Pi. *O.* 9. 83; *I.* 4. 7–8; *N.* 7. 65; Hdt. 9. 85 (Aegina, *ca.* 470); Michel, *Recueil* 310 (Stratus, fifth century).

[7] Hdt. 8. 85 and Th. 1. 129. On the Persian practice, see Wiesehöfer 1980: 7–11; Briant 2002: 303–4, 316. On the Greek practice, see Gauthier 1985: 18–21, who regards the *interpretatio graeca* of Herodotus and Thucydides as "undeniable."

honors: *proxenia* without other honors,[8] the titles *proxenos* and *euergetês* either alone[9] or with other distinctions,[10] the title *euergetês* accompanied by other privileges but not proxeny,[11] proxeny associated with other privileges without *euergesia*,[12] and rewards without the title *euergetês* or *proxenos*.[13] Honors other than *proxenia* and *euergesia* consisted mainly of public praise, *ateleia, xenia* (dinner in the prytaneion), access to the boule and the ecclesia, direct access to the lawcourt of the *polemarchos* (normally without paying), *epimeleia*,[14] a promise of compensation if the honorand was injured, publication of the honorific decree, and erection of a stele financed by the polis. The preserved portions of some fragmentary inscriptions make no mention of concrete honors, but the decrees nonetheless clearly involve rewards for benefactions; these inscriptions too presumably referred to honors such as those previously mentioned.[15] One whole set of proxeny awards makes no mention of the reasons for the grant but, as argued earlier, must also be considered evidence of rewards for benefactors.[16] Finally, references to *proxenia, euergesia*, and other honors can be restored in numerous fragmentary inscriptions, sometimes with a considerable degree of certainty.[17]

[8] In chronological order *IG* I³ 1154 = W 3 and 6; *IG* I³ 118 = W 27; Th. 2. 29. 1; *SEG* XII 41; *IG* I³ 182 = W 60; *IG* I³ 164a = W 68; *SEG* X 140; *IG* I³ 118 = W 86. Cf. Walbank 1978: 10–23.

[9] *IG* I³ 73 + 97 = W 4; Hdt. 8. 136; *IG* I³ 73a–b + 97 = W 7; *IG* II² 17; *IG* I³ 74 = W 46; I³ 174 = W 50; W 62; *IG* I³ 92 = W 65; *SEG* X 111; W 72; *IG* I³ 97 = W 73; *IG* II² 18; *IG* I³ 126 = W 91.

[10] *IG* I³ 23a–b = W 11; *IG* I³ 18a–b = W 12; *IG* I³ 65 = W 39; *IG* I³ 227; *IG* I³ 80 = W 49; *IG* I³ 228 ; *IG* I³ 98; *IG* I³ 110 = W 87.

[11] *IG* I³ 27a = W 13; *IG* I³ 19 = W 14; *IG* I³ 181 = W 52; *IG* I³ 170 = W 54; *SEG* X 129; *IG* II² 187; *IG* I³ 102; *IG* I³ 117 = W 90; *IG* I³ 107 = W 93.

[12] *IG* I³ 1154 = W 9; *IG* I³ 165a = W 35; *IG* I³ 167 = W 43; *IG* I³ 162 = W 44; *IG* I³ 164b = W 55; *IG* I³ 163 = W 56.

[13] Isoc. 15, 166; *IG* I³ 20 = W 10; *SEG* X 76; *IG* I³ 204 = W 20; I³ 156 = W 22; *IG* I³ 24 = W 23; *IG* I³ 55 = W 29; *SEG* X 50; *IG* I³ 28b = W 43; *IG* I³ 159 = W 37; *IG* I³ 160 = W 40; *IG* I³ 161; I³ 69; I³ 73a–b = W 45; *IG* I³ 166 = W 53; *IG* I³ 91 = W 64; *IG* I³ 178 = W 67; *SEG* XXI 57; *IG* II² 17; *IG* I³ 229; *IG* I³ 106 = W 85; I³ 180a = W 88.

[14] Attention to the interests of the honorand, or protection by the boule, the *prytaneis* or the *stratêgoi* against harm, and sometimes protection by the *archontes* as well (Walbank 1978: 496).

[15] *IG* I³ 91 = W 8; *IG* I³ 30 = W 16; *IG* I³ 28a = W 17; *IG* I³ 203a = W 21; *IG* II² 66c = W 26; *IG* I³ 173 = W 28; *IG* I³ 168 = W 36; *IG* I³ 81 = W 48; *IG* I³ 175 = W 51; W 58; W 59; *IG* I³ 177; *SEG* X 120; *SEG* XVI 10; *IG* I³ 114a = W 89; *IG* I³ 179.

[16] Aeschin. 3. 258; S. test. 75 ap. Ath. 13. 603f; Th. 2. 85. 5–6; Arist. *Pol.* 1304ᵃ9–10 + Th. 3. 2. 3 and 4. 4; Polemon fr. 89 Preller; Th. 8. 92. 8; *IG* II² 63, 172.

[17] *Proxenia: IG* I³ 27a = W 13; *IG* I³ 19 = W 14; *IG* I³ 181 = W 52; *SEG* X 129; W 62; *IG* II² 187; *IG* I³ 117 = W 90; *SEG* X 76; *IG* I³ 204 = W 20; *IG* I³ 55 = W 29; *IG* I³ 159 = W 37; *IG* I³ 160 = W 40; *IG* I³ 91 = W 64; *IG* I³ 28a = W 17; *IG* I³ 203a = W 21; *IG* I³ 81; *IG* I³ 175 = W 51; W 59; *IG* I³ 177. *Euergesia: IG* I³ 164a = W 68; *SEG* X 140; *IG* I³ 167 = W 43; *IG* I³ 162 = W 44; *IG* I³ 164b = W 55; *IG* I³ 163 = W 56; *SEG* X 76; *IG* I³ 204 = W 20; *IG* I³ 55 = W 29; *IG* I³ 159 = W 37; *IG* I³ 160 = W 40; *IG* I³ 73 = W 45; *IG* I³ 203a = W 21; *IG* I³ 81 = W 48; *IG* I³ 175 = W 51; W 59; *IG* I³ 177; *IG* II² 63. Other privileges (alleged): *SEG* XII 41; *IG* I³ 97 = W 73; *SEG* X 54; *IG* I³ 91 = W 64. Other privileges (probable): *IG* I³ 182 bis; *IG* II² 6; *IG* I³ 164a = W 68; *IG* I³ 174 = W 50.

In Athens, therefore, benefactors were rewarded above all with the titles *proxenos* and *euergetês*, less often with only one of them, usually the *proxenia*.[18] These titles were not simple honors with no tangible advantages, as might be inferred from the fact that the polis often added privileges such as *ateleia, asylia*, and *epimeleia*. Being inscribed as *proxenos* and/or *euergetês* implied admission to a category of foreigners with a privileged status, although the concrete privileges were ill defined. In some poleis, laws regulated the privileges of *proxenoi* and *euergetai*. But this was not always the case, and even when a law existed, further privileges could be added. Privileges are therefore often mentioned explicitly, although this habit in no way prohibited explicit reference to others that were already attached by law to the titles of *proxenos* and *euergetês*, since reference to these as well served to further highlight the polis' liberality.[19]

The title *proxenos* normally denoted benefactions performed for individuals who resided in or were short-term visitors to the *proxenos*' polis, while the title *euergetês* emphasized benefactions performed for an entire community that was not the *euergetês*' polis. A *proxenos* might also perform (or have performed) services for the entire polis from which he received the title – the title implied that its bearer was a benefactor of the entire city – and these services could be rendered in the polis that granted the title, rather than in the *proxenos*' own polis. But the purpose of mentioning both titles was to highlight the two directions in which benefactions could be oriented (toward persons in the benefactor's polis and those in another place) and the two levels at which it was possible to act (the individual and the communal).[20]

The predominance of the title *proxenos* over *euergetês* demands attention. There are many more examples of grants of *proxenia* without *euergesia* than of *euergesia* without *proxenia*, and the title *proxenos* is routinely mentioned before *euergetês* (i.e., in the formula *proxenos kai euergetês*). This must be related to the finality with which honors were granted to foreigners. As I argued in Chapter 1, Section 3 in relation to proleptic honors, honors were often granted not to reward benefactions but to

[18] Walbank 1978: 4: "The title *euergetês* is seldom found by itself." In most of the previously mentioned inscriptions in which *euergesia* appears alone, *proxenia* can be restored with little hesitation (less certain only in *IG* I³ 170 = W 54; *IG* I³ 107 = W 93). But *IG* I³ 102 and 125 (cf. Walbank 1978: 25 n. 7) show that the title *euergetês* could be awarded without *proxenia*.

[19] Gschnitzer 1973: cols. 710–12; Gauthier 1985: 22–4, 134–6.

[20] Cf. Wilhelm 1942: 11 ff.; Gauthier 1985: 23.

promote them, and even when honors were granted in response to real benefactions, the intent was frequently to continue the sequence of gifts and counter-gifts, so as to retain the recipient in the role of benefactor. The title *euergetês* could be used for this purpose. But the *proxenia* was more effective, since apart from its capacity to generate a feeling of indebtedness, stimulate the wish to obtain more honors, and provide the recipient with an image of benefactor that could oblige him, the *proxenia* evoked the ancient institution of *xenia* (ritualized friendship). *Xenia* was (*inter alia*) an agreement of solidarity and complicity that morally obliged the parties – who became something close to relatives – to watch over one another.[21] Furthermore, as a hereditary distinction, *proxenia* bound not only the original beneficiary to solidarity but entire generations after him – a characteristic shared by *xenia*, whose "bond did not expire with the death of the partners themselves but outlived them and passed on."[22]

1.2 Proxenia *and the origins of euergetism*

The other main reason for the emphasis on the title *proxenos* involves the origins of euergetism. The evidence indicates that the practice of honoring foreigners, being older than that of honoring citizens, was initially reminiscent of *xenia* (guest-friendship or ritualized friendship), and that euergetism was modeled on it. The *proxenia* is then an expression of the influence of *xenia* in the genesis of euergetism, which helps explain why it is so common in rewards for foreigners at the beginning of euergetism.

Of all euergetic honors, the *proxenia* is the one for which we have the earliest evidence.[23] In the beginning, it was inevitable that the relationship between the polis and its foreign benefactor be linked to the institution of *xenia* and that this person tended to be regarded as a kind of *xenos* of the polis: the favors foreigners did the polis were reminiscent of those performed by *xenoi* first because they were performed by someone outside the community. Moreover, these favors often were done by individuals linked to the polis via a relationship of *xenia* with one of its citizens.[24] And "gift-exchange with an outsider" – which is what the exchange of benefactions and honors between the benefactor and the polis consisted of – was

[21] Herman 1987: 10–31. [22] Herman 1987: 17.

[23] *IG* IX, 1², 882 = *Nomima* I 34 (between the end of the seventh century and 550); *SEG* XI add. 1180 a = *Nomima* I 37 (between 600 and 550); Hdt. 8. 136 (beginning of the fifth century); *IG* XII Suppl. 549 = *Nomima* I 39 (*ca.* 475). *Nomima* I 40 (sixth century) may also refer to a grant of *proxenia*.

[24] Herman 1987: 141–2. Cf. Raviola 2005.

precisely "the essential characteristic of guest-friendship" (*xenia*).[25] The fact that the *xenos* often granted favors not just to his partner *xenos* but to his partner's relatives, friends, and fellow citizens as well, also suggests that *xenia* and euergetism are closer than they might seem, and that the Greeks found it easy to perceive the benefactor of their polis as a *xenos*. In an oration by Lysias, an anonymous Athenian says that "Cephisodotus, the defendant's father, was a *xenos* of mine, gentlemen, and when we were in exile, I and any other Athenian who wished to, enjoyed his hospitality in Thebes."[26] It was even possible to become *xenos* of a polis. In a passage of Herodotus previously discussed, Croesus is said to have become a *xenos* of Sparta; Herodotus also reports that Alyattes maintained *xenia* links with Miletus, the Pisistratidae with Sparta, and Xerxes with Acanthus and Abdera.[27] The *xenia* agreement was usually reached after an exchange of gifts or services between the two parties,[28] as in the case of Croesus and Sparta. In a sense, then, the exchange of honors and benefactions with a foreigner invited the polis to take a further step in terms of *xenia*, which is what the title *proxenos* represents. Finally, the habit of honoring foreigners cannot have originated simply from a feeling of community indebtedness for benefactions made by someone external to the group. Political calculation, diplomatic strategies, and the city's trade interests must have played a role as well. At the moment the practice of rewarding foreigners was instituted, therefore, a reward was created – *proxenia* – that evoked *xenia* and predisposed the foreigner to do favors as a *xenos*.

As can be seen, this line of reasoning not only helps explain the role of *proxenia* in euergetism and the relationship between euergetism and *xenia*, but it also sheds light on the controversial question of the origins of *proxenia*. Herman, who has shown the extent to which *proxenia* has its roots in *xenia*, concludes that "someone must have hit upon the idea of supplying the newly constituted communities with a device similar to that which served the lords at whose expense the community had gained power."[29] But how was this step taken? On the hypothesis previously formulated, the mechanism by which the *proxenia* was established must

[25] Herman 1987: 7. On disappointment with *xenoi* who did not reciprocate gifts, see [E.] *Rh.* 399–412; X. *An.* 7. 7. 46; Fantuzzi 2011.

[26] Lys. fr. 286. 2 Carey. The translation is by Herman 1987: 28, who on pp. 22 and 27 mentions several other examples of how *xenia* led to granting favors to an extended circle of people related to the *xenos*.

[27] Hdt 1. 69–70 (Croesus; see Chapter 1, Section 2.1); 1. 22 (Alyattes); 5. 63, 90–1 (cf. [Arist.] *Ath.* 29. 4) (Pisistratidae); 7. 111 (Xerxes and Acanthus); 8. 120 (Xerxes and Abdera).

[28] Herman 1987: 42–3, 48.

[29] Herman 1987: 132.

have been gift-exchange (which was a regular way to enter into a relationship of *xenia*). A polis interested in obtaining continued favors from a foreigner appealed to a norm any Greek could understand, according to which a gift must be reciprocated. As a counter-gift, it chose an honorific title that, like *euergetês*, provided the giver with privileges, but that also evoked a role that persuaded the giver to make benefactions.

2 Polis and athletes

2.1 Statues as rewards

> In the territory of Dyme is also the grave of Oebotas the runner. Although Oebotas was the first among the Achaeans to win an Olympic victory, he yet received from them no special prize (*geras*). Wherefore Oebotas pronounced a curse that no Achaean in future should win an Olympic victory. There must have been some god who was careful that the curse of Oebotas should be fulfilled, but the Achaeans by sending to Delphi at last learned why it was that they had been failing to win the Olympic crown. So they dedicated the statue of Oebotas at Olympia and honored him in other ways, and then Sostratus of Pellene won the footrace for boys.[30]

Pausanias, the author of this passage, adds elsewhere that "the statue of Oebotas was set up by the Achaeans by the command of the Delphic Apollo in the 80th Olympiad (460 BC)."[31] Although we cannot be sure that the Achaeans erected the statue for the reason Pausanias gives, the possibility that in the fifth century a story circulated that an athlete cursed his polis for not rewarding him, and that the polis was able to change its luck in the games by granting the athlete honors, illustrates how deeply the idea that such rewards were deserved had taken root.

We know of several other fifth-century athletes honored with statues in their poleis. A statue of Theagenes of Thasos, victorious in boxing at Olympia in 480 BC and in many other competitions, was erected during his lifetime or shortly thereafter; it fell on and killed one of his enemies.[32] The statue of Euthymus of Locri, three times victorious in boxing at Olympia (480, 476, and 472 BC), was famous because it was hit – like

[30] Paus. 7. 17. 13–14. [31] Paus. 6. 3. 8. Cf. Maddoli, Nafissi, and Saladino 1999: 190–1.
[32] Paus. 6. 11. 2–9. Cf. Maddoli, Nafissi, and Saladino 1999: 250–1.

another statue of Euthymus at Olympia – by lightning while he was still alive.[33] A statue of Astylus of Croton, erected in the temple of Lacinian Hera most likely after his third Olympian victory in 480 BC, was pulled down by his fellow citizens after he let himself be proclaimed Syracusan to please Hieron in two later games.[34] A statue of Ladas of Argos in the temple of Apollo Lycius may have been set up after he took the prize at the Olympic games of 460 BC.[35] A statue of Cheimon of Argos, apparently linked to his Olympic victory of 448 BC, was brought from Argos to the Temple of Peace in Rome.[36] A stone statue of Promachus of Pellene, who took the prize in the pancration at the Isthmian, Nemean, and Olympic games at the end of the fifth century, was erected in the city's gymnasium.[37] The agora of Locri featured a statue of Euthycles, which was destroyed after he was sent to prison for treason; although the date of his victory or victories is unknown, Moretti argues for putting him in the early fifth century.[38] A statue of Cylon was likely erected in Athens at some point after the Persian Wars, and his athletic victories may have been among the motives, as Pausanias seems to believe.[39] As argued in Chapter 2, Section 1.2, finally, the statue of the five-time Olympic victor Hetoemocles (late sixth century) in the agora of Sparta may have been erected by the polis in the fifth century.[40]

At least in the case of Promachus, we can be sure that the polis itself ordered the statue and probably financed it as well.[41] But even if the other statues were initiatives of the athlete or of someone connected to him, they were actual rewards. To anyone familiar with the euergetism of Hellenistic times, this might seem obvious: the statues with which Hellenistic benefactors were honored were often awarded through the initiative of the individual concerned and financed by him.[42] Nonetheless, differences existed between Hellenistic practice and that of fifth-century athletes. In Hellenistic times, the erection of a statue of a benefactor was preceded

[33] Plin. *Nat.* 7. 152. Pliny, who obtained the information from Callimachus, explains that sacrifices to Euthymus were celebrated not only after his death but also in his lifetime, which is probably an exaggeration. On Euthymus, see Currie 2002.
[34] Paus. 6. 13. 1. Cf. Maddoli, Nafissi, and Saladino 1999: 262–3.
[35] Paus. 2. 19. 7. See Moretti 1957: 96 no. 260.
[36] Paus. 6. 9. 3. See Moretti 1957: 101–2; Maddoli, Nafissi, and Saladino 1999: 239–40.
[37] Paus. 6. 8. 5; 7. 27. 5. Cf. Maddoli, Nafissi, and Saladino 1999: 237.
[38] Call. frr. 84–5 Pfeiffer; Moretti 1957: 83–4.
[39] Paus. 1. 28. 1. See Keesling 2003: 177–8.
[40] Paus. 3. 13. 9.
[41] Paus. 7. 27. 5.
[42] This sometimes is stated in the decree: "since he wishes in these matters too to do a favor to the people on account of the present tight circumstances of the public finances and (is willing to) assume the expense for the statue from his private means, he shall take care that the statue set up is as beautiful as possible" (*OGIS* 339; Austin 2006: no. 252).

by a decree in which the polis rewarded the benefactor with the statue, and the statue bore an inscription that reflected the character of reward that justified it: "X (the citizens) honored (*etimêsen* or a similar verb) Y (the benefactor)."[43] Although we have little epigraphic information of this type from the fifth century, no such decrees honor athletes, and inscriptions involving them are normally of a votive nature: "X (the athlete) dedicated (*anethêke*)."

But if the athlete rather than the polis financed the statue, why speak of a reward? If the statue was located in a public space such as the gymnasium, prytaneion, or agora – the agora was "a public, differentiated, 'political' (and to a degree, also sacred) space" – such language seems justified; erection of a statue required the approval of the community of citizens, and this approval was an honor.[44] But if the statue was located in patently sacred space, such as a temple or a sanctuary, so that it nominally represented a thank-offering to the gods, the question becomes more complicated.[45] The response that follows is based in part on Keesling's work on votive statues, although my intention is the opposite from hers, in that I call attention to the nonreligious aspects of votive statues of athletes.[46]

In the sixth and fifth centuries, Greeks rarely dedicated statues representing themselves.[47] Instead, votive statues of this period normally represent gods, heroes, or individuals other than those making the dedication. When statues carry inscriptions, the dedicant is not the person represented; Keesling calls this a "disjunctive representation." The most significant exception to this norm is votive statues representing athletes.[48] By erecting a statue of himself, therefore, the athlete took an exceptional action. The athlete represented in a statue erected by another person was also the protagonist of an extraordinary act; since he appeared as the one

[43] Sometimes the verb is omitted, and only the citizens appear in the nominative and the honored person in the accusative. See McLean 2002: 236–8.

[44] Malkin 1996: 1481 (quotation). On the necessity of authorization by the polis, see Mann 2001: 50.

[45] As Keesling 2003: 42 points out, "both sacred law and custom restricted access to Greek sanctuaries and temples, but regulations governing the placement of *anathêmata* concerned practical issues of access, overcrowding, and caretaking rather than the right to dedicate in the first place."

[46] Keesling 2003: xiv, aims "to resituate Greek sculpture of the Archaic and Classical periods within the practice of votive religion."

[47] Keesling 2003: 21.

[48] Outside the sphere of the statues of athletes, the other main exception are the Geneleus statue group of the Samian Heraeum and some seated statues from Didyma; in both cases, the statues seem to represent the families that dedicated them. These statues all come from sanctuaries in the East, and there may be a connection to the fact that in Near Eastern cultures, self-representation was more normal than in Greek society. See Keesling 2003: 16–21, 169–70; also Rausa 1994: 15–16.

who dedicated the statue, an act of self-representation was "technically" involved. The exceptionality of the act was surely due to the fact that, for whatever reason, self-representation was not easily accepted even though no law forbade it. At the same time, self-representation was doubtless perceived as a privilege. To display oneself and one's achievements, to stand out among others, was among the obsessions of Greek elites. The statue of the athlete was, in this sense, highly effective: this was the only sculpture of a human being in which the identity of the represented individual was clear (since the inscription functioned as a label) and the dedicant was represented. If the norm was that an ancient Greek standing before a votive sculpture asked himself first "Who dedicated this?"[49] (with the represented person, whose identity often went unrecognized, remaining in the background), before a sculpture of an athlete, his initial question was "Who is this?" The person who dedicated a sculpture representing someone other than himself (human, divine, or semidivine) could only show off through the inscription and the quality of the monument, whereas someone who dedicated an athletic sculpture could do so through the image as well.[50]

The inscription on the base of the statue of Euthymus in Olympia shows that votive statues were addressed not only to gods but also to mortals, whom they were intended to impress. The inscription proclaims that the statue aims to be admired, but the victor's desire to elicit the same reaction patently lies behind the device:

> Euthymus of Locri, son of Astycles, having won three times at Olympia, set up this figure to be admired by the mortals. Euthymus of Locri Epizephyrii dedicated it. Pythagoras of Samos made it.[51]

The right of an Olympic victor to dedicate a statue of himself in the sacred precinct, the Altis, was considered such an honor that Pausanias twice presents it as among the prizes for a triumph: [52]

[49] Keesling 2003: 22–4.

[50] Plin. *Nat.* 34. 16, drawing on a Hellenistic source, coincides in essence with what can be deduced from the archaeological and epigraphic information: "It was not customary to make effigies of human beings unless they deserved lasting commemoration for some distinguished reason, in the first case victory in the sacred contests and particularly those at Olympia, where it was the custom to dedicate statues of all who had won a competition."

[51] *I. Olympia* 144 (trans. Miller 2012: no. 166b). The fact that "to be admired by mortals" was added later (it stands in a *rasura*), although not much later, is irrelevant, since the phrase transmits the same philosophy about the function of the statue as if it belonged to the original inscription. See Lattimore 1988: 251.

[52] Paus. 5. 21. 1, 25. 1.

Whereas on the Athenian Acropolis statues are votive offerings (*anathêmata*) like everything else, in the Altis some things are dedicated only in honor of the gods, and statues are merely part of the prizes awarded to the victors.

I shall also mention those offerings which are of a different kind, and not representations of Zeus. The statues which have been set up, not to honor a deity, but to reward mere men, I shall include in my account of the athletes.

These passages cannot be taken to show (as Furtwängler believed) that the statues at Olympia were not votive.[53] This was certainly not the case in the time of Pausanias, when the words *anathêma* and *anethêke* appear on numerous monuments.[54] But nor does it seem to have been so in archaic and classical times, when *anethêke* also appears.[55] Although Hyde attempted an intermediate solution ("some athlete statues may have been votive, while others were not"), most likely all statues of athletes were votive, regardless of whether or not the word *anethêke* appeared in the inscription.[56] Statues of athletes nonetheless constituted a special category among votives: against the general rule, they were self-representations. As Hyde notes, athletes at Olympia and other game sites must originally have limited themselves to dedicating part of their prize (e.g., a bowl), in the same way that soldiers dedicated a portion of their booty. Sometimes athletes also dedicated items they had used to practice their event (e.g., stone jumping weights)[57] or a figure that represented it (e.g., a horse).[58] In this context, it must eventually have seemed appropriate to represent the athlete himself – and at the same moment, it must have been obvious that this self-representation was a privilege.

The fact that the word *anethêke* is missing from many statues of athletes may be significant, as an indication of the extent to which the votive statue was perceived as a monument in the athlete's honor. If the omission of *anethêke* was due instead to the fact that it was obvious that the statue was a votive monument and thus unnecessary to note the fact,[59] the frequency with which the omission occurred must eventually have helped arouse the perception that the statue was a monument in the athlete's honor. An inscription on a statue of Callias son of Didymias (victorious in

[53] Furtwängler 1880: 29. See also Lippold 1923: 2265–73 [54] For examples, see Hyde 1921: 39.
[55] For example, the inscriptions on the statues of Agiadas, probably winner in 488 BC (*I. Olympia* 150); Tellon, winner in 472 BC (*I. Olympia* 147–8); and Cyniscus, who may have won in 460 BC (*I. Olympia* 149), and on a statue made by Pythagoras for an unknown athlete (*I. Olympia* 145). See Lattimore 1988: 252.
[56] Hyde 1921: 39; cf. Reisch 1890: 35–7; Amandry 1957: 69–71; Schweitzer 1963: 135–8; Gross 1969–1971: 64; Ebert 1972: 16–22; Herrmann 1972: 114; Buhmann 1975: 63; Hausmann 1977: 131.
[57] See the examples in Moretti 1953: nos. 1, 8. [58] Hyde 1921: 21–4. [59] Reisch 1890: 35–7.

472 BC) gives an idea of the effect that statues of athletes with such inscriptions must have produced – this was a monument in honor of the athlete:

Callias the Athenian son of Didymias [won] the pancration.
Micon the Athenian made [the statue].[60]

The fact that one of the prizes bestowed on an Olympic victor was the right to represent himself in a statue[61] suggests that in his polis the same act was regarded as a reward. This was again a case of "reduplication" of honors, along with *sitêsis* and *proedria*. What at the site of the games was a prize (*athlon*) was viewed in the polis as a reward (*geras*) – the reward Oebotas so longed for in the story with which this section began.

The story of Oebotas also touches on the fact that the poleis honored their athletes with statues outside their territory, at Olympia and other relevant spots. Promachus (mentioned earlier) received a statue at Olympia,[62] and there are hints that Euthymus' city ordered a second statue of him at Olympia.[63] Already in the fourth century, Clazomenae dedicated a statue of Herodotus at Olympia for having been the first Clazomenian victor at the games, and Erythrae as well dedicated a statue of Epitherses, winner in the four great Panhellenic games, at Olympia.[64] Their communities gave the same honor posthumously to Chionis of Sparta, a victor in the seventh century but honored only at the beginning of the fifth; to Eutelidas of Sparta, an Olympic victor in 628 BC (meaning that the statue was not contemporary, as some scholars suggest); and to Polydamas of Scotussa, who was victorious at Olympia in 408 BC and was honored by his fellow citizens a quarter century or so later.[65]

[60] *I. Olympia* 146 (trans. Lattimore 1988: 251).

[61] Hyde 1921: 27, 37–8; Lippold 1923: 2266; Buhmann 1975: 62–6; Kyle 1987: 145; Herrmann 1988: 119; Lattimore 1988: 248; Rausa 1994: 17–18; Smith 2007: 97.

[62] Paus. 6. 8. 5; 7. 27. 5.

[63] Plin. *Nat.* 7. 152, the statue of Euthymus at Olympia, from which I have reproduced the inscription (*I. Olympia* 144; see von Gaertringen 1907: col. 1514). Dedicated by Euthymus himself, it may originally have been dedicated by the polis, to judge from the *rasura* (Lippold 1923: 269; Buhmann 1975: 82–3; Lattimore 1988: 251).

[64] Herodotus: Paus. 6. 17. 2. Epitherses: Paus. 6. 15. 6. Stier 1938: 1903 and Moretti 1953: 26 assume that the statues of the Pythian victor Phaylus of Croton at Delphi (Paus. 10. 9. 2) and on the Athenian acropolis (*IG* I^3 823 = Moretti 1953: no. 11) were honors of the polis for its athlete. But there is no evidence to this effect.

[65] Chionis: Paus. 6. 13. 2 (see Moretti 1957: nos. 42–7; Rausa 1994: 101). Eutelidas: Paus. 6. 15. 8 (see Lattimore 1988: 249; Mann 2001: 138; but Lippold 1923: 2265–73; Buhmann 1975: 59; Herrmann 1988: 120; Decker 2001: col. 534). Polydamas: Paus. 6. 5. 7 (see Moretti 1957: 110 no. 348; the statue must have been erected at least 25 years after his death, if it was a work by Lysippus, as Pausanias reports: see Miller 2004: 161).

Not all victorious athletes received a statue in their polis. Whether in the polis or at the game site, statues were granted only under special circumstances: if the athlete were the first to obtain a victory for his polis, for instance, or the first in a long time or in a certain event, as in the case of Herodotus; if he had obtained numerous victories in a row, like Euthymus and Astylus; if the victories were accompanied by other achievements, as in the case of Promachus (to which I will return);[66] or if the athlete simply enjoyed – for whatever reason – the necessary support within his community. In the case of statues erected long after the athlete's death, the wish for glory for the polis whose name appeared in the inscription together with the victor's name, as well as rivalry with other poleis, must have played a significant role, especially when the statue was erected at the site of the games. The statue placed by Sparta at Olympia in honor of Chionis, for example, was a reaction to the victories of Astylus, a runner from Croton;[67] officially the statue was a reward for the athlete.

2.2 Other possible (and impossible) rewards

Victorious athletes were not rewarded only with statues. Some poleis seem to have made a practice of engraving athletes' names on a stele, a less distinguished reward than a statue but one that all victorious athletes, not only a subset of them, would have enjoyed. The only known list of this type, from Iulis in Ceos, dates to the fourth century and reproduces the names and events of fifth-century victors at the Isthmian and Nemean games.[68] The Rhodian historian Gorgon, by contrast, preserves information about a more exceptional reward: an ode composed by Pindar for the boxer Diagoras of Rhodes, winner in all the Panhellenic games, to celebrate his Olympic victory in 464 BC. The ode was reproduced in gold letters in the temple of Athena at Lindus;[69] as Christian Mann points out, fixing it in one of the most important public buildings in the city was a tremendous honor, whether this was ordered by the polis or by the athlete himself with the advance agreement of the citizens.[70]

In Chapter 2, Section 1.2, I noted that Pindar and Bacchylides refer to festive welcomes for athletes,[71] a custom also mentioned by later sources.[72] As at the games, the athlete was showered with flowers, ribbons, crowns, and other gifts.[73] After his Olympic victory in 412 BC, Exaenetus of

[66] Paus. 7. 17. 5: Promachus killed several enemies in a war between Pellene and Corinth.
[67] Paus. 6. 13. 2. [68] *IG* XII, 5, 608 = *Syll.*³ 1057. [69] Pi. *O.* 7; Gorgon *FGrH* 515 F 18.
[70] Mann 2001: 43. [71] Pi. *P.* 9. 74; *I.* 8. 1–5; Bacch. 13. 67 ff. [72] Vitr. 9. praef.
[73] Paus. 6. 7. 3; Plu. *Mor.* 723c.

Acragas was taken by chariot to his homeland, where he was accompanied in a procession by 300 chariots prepared by his fellow citizens.[74] In the context of welcome receptions such as these, part of the city wall was sometimes pulled down: a polis with men such as the athlete needed no other protection.[75]

There are many references to cults for dead athletes,[76] including some of the men whose statues were mentioned – Theagenes, Euthymus, Polydamas, and Euthycles.[77] But a cult does not belong to the category of rewards for athletes, for athletes were not worshiped for their merits. Instead, their personalities became encrusted with legends that led others to believe that a special force emanated from them and could, for example, produce healing.[78] Some of these athletes had in fact performed actions that were anything but benefactions. Diognetus of Crete killed his opponent in boxing at the end of the sixth century or the beginning of the fifth, while Cleomedes of Astypalaea did the same in 492 BC; both men were deprived of their crowns.[79]

The sources that mention cults of individual athletes also report that their statues received worship. Pausanias says that "the Thasians . . . are wont to sacrifice to him [the statue of Theagenes] as to a god"; that Polydamas' statue "heals those who have fevers"; and that the Locrians "honored [Euthycles'] statue as equal to that of Zeus."[80] This does not mean that the statues of these athletes were originally erected to be worshiped.[81] In the stories about these athletes, the statue is not mentioned at the end of the account, as a culmination of a series of extraordinary events that led to worship of the athlete. Instead, it is referred to at the beginning and is often an incidental cause in the process by which the athlete is deemed to have been an extraordinary human being.

The statue of Theagenes, for example, stood in the agora of Thasos after his death. One of his enemies mistreated it daily, as if he were ill treating

[74] D.S. 13. 82. [75] Plu. *Mor.* 639e (cf. Osborne 2009: 62); Suet. *Nero* 25.
[76] For the evidence, see Buhmann 1975: 134–5.
[77] Theagenes: Paus. 6. 11. 2–9; Luc. *Deor. Conc.* 12. Euthymus: Plin. *Nat.* 7. 152. Euthycles: Call. frr. 84–5 Pfeiffer; Moretti 1957: 83–4. Polydamas: Paus. 6. 5. 7; Luc. *Deor. Conc.* 12.
[78] See Nilsson 1967: 190; Buhmann 1975: 134; Bohringer 1979: 5–18.
[79] For Diognetes, see Moretti 1957: no. 181. For Cleomedes, see Paus. 6. 9. 6–8; Plu. *Rom.* 28; Moretti 1957: no. 174. These sources even attribute to Cleomedes the demolition of a pillar that supported the roof of a school and the consequent death of 60 children.
[80] Theagenes: Paus. 6. 11. 8. Euthymus: Plin. *Nat.* 7. 152. Euthycles: Call. frr. 84–5 Pfeiffer. Polydamas: Luc. *Deor. Conc.* 12.
[81] Paus. 6. 11. 9, for example, writes: "There are many other places I know of, both among Greeks and among barbarians, where images have been set up of Theagenes, who cures diseases and receives honors from natives."

Theagenes himself, until the statue fell on him and killed him. The Thasians reacted by dropping the statue into the sea, but bad harvests followed. The Pythia advised them to restore the statue, and they were thrown into a quandary over how to follow her advice, until fishermen caught the statue in their nets; from that moment on, the Thasians sacrificed to it as if to a god. The story of the statue of Euthycles is similar. Having returned from an embassy with some mules, the gift of a host, Euthycles was accused of treason, and the assembly decided to damage his statue. This time plague followed. When Apollo informed the Locrians that the cause was the dishonor visited on Euthycles, they at once began to honor the statue and set up an altar. The information about Euthymus is less detailed, but the sequence of events is essentially the same. His statues (one at Locri, another at Olympia) were struck by lightning on the same day. The oracle ordered that sacrifices be carried out; according to Callimachus, they were made regularly both in Euthymus' lifetime (which seems unlikely) and after his death.[82] Pausanias' story of Oebotas is at first glance different, since the erection of the statue takes place at the end: unable to achieve athletic victories, the Achaeans consulted the Delphic oracle and subsequently dedicated a statue of Oebotas at Olympia to cancel his curse on them. But the curse was due precisely to the fact that Oebotas had not been rewarded for his victories, and the statue at Olympia constituted above all else the reward the city had failed to grant him at the appropriate time. Polydamas' statue was also located at Olympia and was originally intended to honor his victory. Only afterward, according to Lucian, did it turn out to possess healing powers.[83]

These observations should not be allowed to obscure the fact that every statue of a victorious athlete, from the moment it was erected and before legends about him or it could emerge, lent itself to becoming the object of hero cult. The gods, after all, had chosen the athlete, and his victory was their gift. The polis that erected or approved the erection of an athlete statue was aware of its "talismanic power,"[84] just as it was aware of its decorative value and usefulness in spreading the glory of the polis (since the athlete's victory was the polis' victory as well). But these aspects were subordinated to the statue's two main functions: as votive offering and reward. Depending on the circumstances – where the statue was erected

[82] Theagenes: Paus. 6. 11. 6–9. Euthymus: Plin. *Nat.* 7. 152. Euthycles: Call. frr. 84–5 Pfeiffer.
[83] Polydamas: Paus. 6. 5. 7; Luc. *Deor. Conc.* 12. Oebotas: Paus. 7. 17. 13–14.
[84] Kurke 1992: 111–12; Keesling 2003: 178.

and at whose expense – one function was more prominent than the other. I return to these questions later, in connection with Athens.

The importance of statues as commemorative monuments of athletic victories also finds expression in the *epinikia*. References to victory statues and metaphors that compare the poet's activity to that of a sculptor abound in these songs; indeed, the *epinikia* themselves are depicted by the poets as victory statues.[85] The analogy is based not only on the fact that in the context of the polis, the *epinikion* as well as the statue were gifts of the athlete to the community – an extension of the benefaction athletic triumph represented[86] – but also on the fact that both were counter-gifts of the community (as discussed in Chapter 2).

Of all the rewards the athlete received, the *epinikion* is the most enigmatic from a chronological point of view. As noted, evidence of statues appears throughout the fifth century, and *sitêsis* and *proedria* continued to be awarded to athletes in the second half of the century. *Epinikia*, on the other hand, practically disappear around 450 BC. In the fifth century after Pindar's last poem (446 BC), we have only the *epinikion* composed by Euripides for Alcibiades' victory in 416 BC.[87] It cannot be maintained that the epinikian tradition vanished completely. There is the "new Posiddipus," and as Hornblower has observed, we must also consider the phenomenon of re-performance of old *epinikia*, as well as the possibility that new *epinikia* were composed by "bad" poets who left no trace. Nevertheless, something happened with *epinikia* in the second half of the fifth century, and as Golden points out, "such a change in fashion needs more explanation than the death of one man."[88] The most common explanation is the disappearance of the type of "aristocratic" client the epinikian poets worked for.[89] But other factors may have played a role as well. Perhaps athletes began to concentrate their efforts on immortalization in bronze or marble, with the statue seeming to offer advantages over an *epinikion*. Even if one does not share Pfeijffer's view of the limited impact of the *epinikion* after its first performance,[90] it was sung several times at most: at the games or in the polis after the victory, and then perhaps – following Currie's classification – at unofficial, semiofficial, or official

[85] Steiner 2001. [86] Kurke 1991.
[87] Plu. *Alc.* 11. 2; *Dem.* 1. 1; E. *PMG* 755 ap. Ath. 1. 3e. On the date of Pindar's death, see Neumann-Hartmann 2009: 20.
[88] Golden 1998: 84; Hornblower 2012. [89] Cf. Hornblower 2012.
[90] Pfeijffer 1999: 10: "The impact of a Pindaric ode on subsequent audiences can be compared to a pebble that is thrown into a pond, causing concentric circles of rippling water, the intensity of which decreases the further away one gets from the centre. An ode had its deepest significance for its first audience attending the official celebration for which it was written."

re-performances (e.g., in response to a spontaneous request from the participants at a symposium, by a chorus in a re-performance that involved at least the extended family, or – although this is disputed – at a festival organized by the polis).[91] The statue, by contrast – especially if it stood in the agora – was seen daily by many people and thus represented a continuous homage. Moreover, despite Pindar's efforts to convince his audience of the contrary,[92] a statue provided a greater sense of perpetuity than an *epinikion* did, as the decision to inscribe Pindar's *epinikion* for Diagoras of Rhodes in Athena's temple at Lindus suggests. The metaphoric references to statues in *epinikia* can be understood, in fact, as reflections of a contest between two types of monuments, a contest in which sculpture ultimately prevailed. But this was not the only competition: there was also a competition between the achievements of the honorand and the achievements of the poet, which could come to overshadow the athlete. This became clear in unofficial re-performances, where the poet and his creation – not the laudandus – normally formed the center of attention for the performer and the audience.[93]

The interests of the polis, the other party implicated in the act of honoring athletes, may also have contributed to the quasi-disappearance of *epinikia* and what may have been their replacement by statues. In Chapter 2, I referred to the possibility that some honors were more easily controlled by the polis than others. In this sense, statues – at least those planned for public spaces – were more controllable than *epinikia*, since erection of them had to be approved by the polis. Sculpture offered at least as great a potential as *epinikia* for linking the polis to a great victory (since the name of the polis accompanied the name of the winner) and to announce the glory the polis had obtained in an inscription whose permanence proclaimed the polis as much as it did the athlete himself.

3 Athenian exceptionalism?

3.1 The absence and presence of athlete statues

A passage of Lycurgus' speech against Leocrates indicates that Athens was a special case when it came to statues for athletes:

[91] On the re-performance of *epinikia*, see Currie 2004; Carey 2007: 209–10; Neumann-Hartmann 2009: 72, 142–3, 210–11; Currie 2011; Morrison 2012. On the improbability of re-performances in civic festivals, see Carey 2007: 201 n. 11 and Chapter 2, Section 1.2.

[92] Cf. O'Sullivan 2003; Currie 2004: 66–7. [93] Currie 2004: 53–4.

You, Athenians, alone among Greeks know how to honor valiant men. In other cities, you will find, it is the athletes who have their statues in the market place, whereas in yours it is victorious generals and the slayers of the tyrants: men whose like it is hard to find though we search the whole of Greece for but a few, whereas the winners of contests for a wreath have come from many places and can easily be seen.[94]

The situation Lycurgus describes in 330 BC contrasts with the one that, according to Plutarch, Alexander found when he entered Miletus at more or less the same time: the city was full of athlete statues, which would seem to indicate that they stood not only in sacred spaces but also in public ones as well.[95] Lycurgus' description is generally taken to be accurate and fits what we know from the archaeological and written sources, particularly the passage of Demosthenes cited later.[96] But the following points must be made. First and foremost, Lycurgus does not mention that the Athenian agora had since *ca.* 335 BC contained a statue of another individual who was not a general or one of the Tyrannicides: the orator Demades. (The omission does not surprise, since Demades' statue was opposed by Lycurgus, who considered him "unworthy of a *dôrea*."[97]) The statue of Neoptolemus proposed by Lycurgus for having gilded the altar of Apollo as well as Epicrates' statue rewarding his reform of the *ephebia* were most likely erected before 330 BC, but we do not know their locations.[98] The statues of the tragedians Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides – all granted before 330 BC – and the statue of Astydamas – perhaps granted in 340 BC – were placed in the theater of Dionysus;[99] the statue of Socrates mentioned by Diogenes Laertius and normally attributed to the Lycurgan period was placed in the Pompeium.[100] Finally, in the fifth century the agora did not look as it did in Lycurgus' time, for not only were there no statues of athletes, there were none of generals either. The first general to be honored with a statue was Conon, in 393 BC, as a consequence of his victory at Cnidus,[101] and the only statues of human

[94] Lycurg. 1. 51 (tr. Burtt). [95] Plu. *Mor.* 180a.
[96] A potentially challenging source is the dedication of Leagrus, discussed later.
[97] Din. 1. 101; Lycurg. fr. 9 Conomis = 14 Butt = 8 Durrbach. The statue was also criticized by Polyeuctus: Apsines 10. 6 (198 Dilts–Kennedy).
[98] Neoptolemus: Plu. *Mor.* 843f–4a. The text cites the motion to award the statue just before mentioning that the honors for Diotimus were moved in 334 BC. Epicrates: Harp. s. v. "Epikrates". His reform probably dates from 336–335 BC (see Chapter 5, Section 3.3). The statue of Diphilus proposed by Demosthenes (Din. 1. 43) was certainly in the agora, but when was it erected?
[99] Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides: Plu. *Mor.* 841f; Paus. 1. 21. 1–2; Astydamas: D.L. 2. 43; Astydamas II, *TrGF* 60 T 2a and b. Eubulus was also honored before 330 BC (Hyp. frr. 104–6 Jensen), but we do not know if his honors included a statue (cf. Gauthier 1985: 106).
[100] D.L. 2. 43. [101] On the date when he was honored, see Gauthier 1985: 96–7.

beings visible in the fifth century were of Harmodius and Aristogiton. Such, at least, is the implication of the following passage of Demosthenes:

> His contemporaries not only granted him [Conon] immunity, but also set up his statue in bronze – the first man so honored since Harmodius and Aristogiton.[102]

This passage implies that in this period, the Athenians did not treat any athlete in the way that, according to Pausanias, Pellene treated Promachus: "The Pellenians made two statues of him, dedicating one at Olympia and one in the gymnasium."[103] The known cases of statues set up outside the agora by the Athenian demos to honor citizens are significantly later than the statues for Conon and other generals.[104] Everything thus indicates that after the Athenians rewarded Harmodius and Aristogiton with statues at the end of the sixth century or the beginning of the fifth, they thought no one else worthy of this honor until the 300s, and that when they began to award it again, they did so with statues in the same area.

The situation was different in other poleis. As noted earlier, there is considerable evidence of athletes being rewarded with statues in the fifth century, and most of these statues were erected precisely in the city's agora.[105] This is clear in the cases of Theagenes of Thasos, Euthycles of Locri, and Hetoemocles of Sparta; is very probable in the case of Euthymus of Locri; and cannot be ruled out in the case of Cheimon of Argos. The remains of the base of the monument for Theagenes are still visible in the agora on Thasos.[106] Pindar's *Nemean* 3 also shows that statues of athletes were traditionally erected in the agora; as Steiner observes, "the *agalma* erected by the composer and his chorus on behalf of the victor Aristoclidas turns out to be no private dedication, but a statue destined for the agora at Aegina, whose communal glory and visible magnificence it will enhance."[107] One of the very few sixth-century athlete statues recorded, that of Arrhachion, also stood in the agora.[108]

[102] D. 20. 70 (tr. Vince). [103] Paus. 6. 8. 5; 7. 27. 5 (tr. Jones).

[104] The statues of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides are from the 330s BC (see Hanink 2014: 74–82). The date of Astydamas' statue suggested by the sources – 340 BC – is controversial. Ma 2013: 110 is skeptical, while Hanink 2014: 183–8 accepts it and tries to reconstruct the context. On the date of Socrates' statue (Lycurgan or later), cf. Dillon 2006: 104. On the dates of other fourth-century statues outside the agora, particularly those of Miltiades and Themistocles in the prytaneion (Paus. 1. 18. 3), see Zanker 1995: 63–4 and Chapter 4, Section 2.2.

[105] Lattimore 1988: 249.

[106] Theagenes: Paus. 6. 11. 2–9; on the monument: Miller 2004: 164–5; cf. Ma 2013: 114. Euthycles: Call. frr. 84–5 Pfeiffer. Hetoemocles: Paus. 3. 13. 9. Euthymus: Plin. *Nat.* 7. 152 (cf. Steiner 2001: 260). Cheimon: Paus. 6. 9. 3.

[107] Steiner 2001: 273 (see also 260).

[108] Paus. 8. 40. 1: "The Phigalians have in their market-place a statue of the pancratiast Arrhachion."

The lack of honors by way of statues, however, and the absence of statues from the Athenian agora do not mean that there were no statues of Athenian athletes in the city. Pausanias mentions among the statues on the acropolis one of Epicharinus, "who practiced the race in armor," by Critius, who was active at the beginning of the fifth century; the base has been found and features an inscription mentioning the name of a second sculptor, Nesiotes, whom Pausanias omits. The lack of reference to the event reflects the tendency for athlete statues on the acropolis to feature briefer inscriptions than those at Olympia; Pausanias' reference to racing in arms suggests that the athlete obtained a victory in one of the great games, probably around 475 BC.[109]

The base of a bronze statue dedicated by the pancratiast Callias son of Didymias, which records victories at Olympia, Delphi, Isthmia, Nemea, and the Panathenaea, was also found on the acropolis. We know from Pausanias and the inscription (reproduced in Section 2.1 in this chapter) that a victory statue of Callias by Micon stood at Olympia, and a column base has been discovered on the Athenian acropolis that probably supported a stone statue erected on the occasion of his victory in a boys' competition. Callias must have ordered the erection of the statue commemorating his victories in the four great Panhellenic games and the Panathenaea before his ostracism (probably shortly after 450 BC).[110] Another statue base on the acropolis – in this case dated by the letter-forms to between 450 BC and 400 BC – records victories by the dedicant, Pronapes son of Pronapides, at Nemea, Isthmia, the Panathenaea, and probably elsewhere. The base seems to have supported a four-horse chariot and a statue of Pronapes himself standing next to it.[111]

In other cases, the evidence does not allow us to be certain that athlete statues are in question, but the likelihood that at least some of them were, is high.[112] One example is the base of a bronze statue on the acropolis dedicated by Callias son of Hipponicus (called "Lakkoploutos"). Although the inscription is laconic ("Callias the son of Hipponicus dedicated"), we know from other sources that Callias was a triple Olympic winner at the beginning of the fifth century. It has been suggested that the

[109] Paus. 1. 23. 9. Inscription and date: *IG* I³ 847; Raubitschek 1949: no. 120. On the other information, see Kyle 1987: 201, A 24; Keesling 2003: 15, 29, 66, 170–2.

[110] Bronze statue in the acropolis: Raubitschek 1949: no. 164; *IG* I³ 893. On the date: Raubitschek 1939: 157; Kyle 1987: 203, A 29. Statue at Olympia: Paus. 6. 6. 1; *I. Olympia* 146 (see Habicht 1998: 150 nn. 43–4). Stone statue: Raubitschek 1949: no. 21; *IG* I³ 826.

[111] Raubitschek 1939: 158–60; Raubitschek 1949: no. 174; *IG* I³ 880; Kyle 1987: 210, A 57; Keesling 2003: 66, 171, 228 n. 11.

[112] Keesling 2003: 171.

statue was of Aphrodite by Calamis. Raubitschek, however, considers it likely that it was of Callias himself, and he attributes the silence of the literary tradition about it to the devastation caused by the Persian sack of 480 BC.[113]

Lycurgus refers to a statue of Hipparchus son of Charmus, who according to the Ps.-Aristotelian *Athenaion Politeia* was ostracized in 487 BC. According to Lycurgus, the Athenians "took down his statue from the acropolis and, melting it down, made a pillar of it, on which they decreed that the names of sinners and traitors should be inscribed," an event that, if historical, occurred before 480 BC. Considering "the relative rarity of non-athletic portraits in the fifth century," the safest assumption is that this too was an athletic victory statue, as Raubitschek (followed by Keesling) suggests.[114]

Pausanias also saw a statue of "Hermolycus the pancratiast," which he unfortunately chose not to discuss because, he maintains, others had already commented on Hermolycus. The individual in question is probably the "Hermolycus, son of Euthoenus, who practised the pancration" mentioned by Herodotus, from whom we know that Hermolycus played a significant role in the battle of Mycale (479 BC) and died in Cyrnus fighting the Carystians (472 BC). The statue could therefore be a victor statue from the beginning of the fifth century, but it might also be later and related to Hermolycus' military exploits and tragic end.[115] Another possible bit of evidence is a statue base from the acropolis with an inscription dated by the letter-forms to around 440 BC. Micon, famous for his victor statues, is described as the sculptor. This fact, along with the elongated shape of the base, appropriate for representing a man and a horse, suggests that this too may have been a statue of a victorious athlete.[116]

There is no need to deal with more problematic cases, such as the dedication by Timotheus son of Conon, an ancestor of the famous fourth-century general, or the statue of "Autolycus the pancratiast" seen by Pausanias in the prytaneion.[117] The examples already cited are enough to

[113] Inscription: *IG* I³ 835; Raubitschek 1949: no. 111. Literary source: schol. Ar. *Nu*. 64; see also Raubitschek 1939: 156; Keesling 2003: 170–1. Cf. Kyle 1987: 203–4, A 31.

[114] Lycurg. 1. 117 (tr. Burtt); [Arist.] *Ath*. 22. 4 (also Androtion *FGrH* 324 F 6); Raubitschek 1939: 155; Keesling 2003: 179, 256 n. 41 (quotation). On Hipparchus son of Charmus, see Brenne 2001: 161; Ober 2008: 187–9.

[115] Paus. 1. 23. 10; Hdt. 9. 105.

[116] *IG* I³ 881; Lippold 1932: col. 1558; Raubitschek 1939: 157; Raubitschek 1949: no. 139.

[117] It has been suggested that the dedication by Timotheus might correspond to an athlete (Kyle 1987: 227, P 113), but we have no data about Timotheus' life that refers to athletic activities, nor does anything argue against the possibility that the statue represented an anthropomorphic figure but

support Raubitschek's judgment that "in the first half of the fifth century the dedications of victor statues became popular in Athens," and recent work by Keesling corroborates this interpretation.[118] The question is how to evaluate the presence of athlete statues in Athens. They do not constitute honors comparable to those awarded by the polis to generals such as Conon in the fourth century. But were they simply private dedications?

3.2 *Between honorific statue and private dedication*

In Section 2.1, I attempted to demonstrate that the border between an honorific statue and a private dedication is not as sharp as modern scholarship would have us believe. Self-representation – the erection of a votive portrait statue dedicated by the person represented – was unusual in the archaic age and the fifth century. The Greeks were aware that such a dedication was not only a religious act but also one of self-display. Keesling writes: "We are entitled to conclude that the perceived efficacy of honorific statues depends upon being able to see the name of the honorand inscribed on the base, whereas votive inscriptions always emphasize the name of the dedicator."[119] This characteristic of honorific statues is also present in athlete statues, even though they are votives. The victor statues of Olympia, which often omit any reference to the fact that they are dedications, are clearly halfway between a votive statue and an honorific one. Few individuals in the Greek world – in the case of Athens this is obvious – were allowed to represent themselves, victorious athletes in the great games being the only group that enjoyed this right in a generalized way. Self-representation was therefore a privilege. This privilege, moreover, evoked what at Olympia was considered part of the prize, as well as the tradition of transforming what at Olympia were prizes, such as *sitêsis*, into rewards in the polis. The fact that Athens in the fourth century began to reward benefactors with statues is further proof that an athlete's right to a portrait statue with his name inscribed was a great honor: "the honor of

not an athlete (Raubitschek 1949: no. 47 recognizes that the statue could have been of Aphrodite; see also Krumeich 1997: 112–13). Despite having been victorious in the pancration at the Panathenaea in 422, Autolycus does not seem to have been an exceptional athlete, and his popularity was largely due to his role in politics (Mann 2001: 114–17). On the other hand, even if his statue was erected for "political" reasons, what official motive other than his athletic merits could have been given for placing it in the prytaneion? Perhaps his dramatic death at the hands of the Thirty? Plin. *Nat*. 34. 19 reports that the statue was by Leochares, whose *floruit* is 350–320 BC but assigns the statue to 372–369 BC. Kyle 1987: 198, A 12, believes that Pliny made a mistake and that the artist was Lycius, active in the second half of the fifth century.

[118] Raubitschek 1939: 154; Keesling 2003: esp. 170–5. [119] Keesling 2003: 167.

a portrait statue became meaningful in Athens in the fourth century precisely because few individuals were expected to represent themselves."[120]

If the statue was ordered by the polis, such as that of Promachus of Pellene, the decision was probably voted in the assembly, while if the athlete took the initiative and wanted to set up his statue in a place such as the agora, that too required the authorization of the polis. But it is unlikely that any authorization was needed to erect a statue in a sanctuary. Formally, this was an act of gratitude to the gods that took place in a sacred space. All the same, the fact that this act, accompanied by self-representation and everything that evoked (privileges, prizes), was allowed was a consequence of the glory the athlete brought the polis. In this sense, this reward – like the *epinikion* or the welcome by fellow citizens – required no formality; thanks to his victory, the athlete was automatically entitled to it, with no formal request.

The differences between the honorific statue and the statue as private dedication become even less significant when we look more closely at the former. Just as the private dedication had elements of the honorific statue, so too the latter had characteristics of the former. Individuals honored with statues in Athens from the fourth century onward often had to pay for them.[121] This detail, apart from being typical of private dedications, indicates that the privilege of representing oneself with a statue was far more honorific than the fact that the polis, as sometimes happened, paid for the statue.

If athletes in Athens in the fifth century managed to erect statues representing themselves in public spaces and not only in sacred spaces, this would be closer to a public reward. The statue of Autolycus discussed earlier was probably not erected until the fourth century, and the reasons for it are unclear. But if it was set up in the fifth century to commemorate an athletic victory, it is worth considering that it may have been placed in the prytaneion.[122] A more complicated case is the base of a statue dedicated by Leagrus to the Twelve Gods discovered in 1934 in the agora.[123] Raubitschek, noting the association of the Twelve Gods with athletics, as well a vase painting in Baltimore that seems to represent an athlete statue and bears the inscription *Leagros kalos*, theorized that the base belongs to a victor statue Leagrus erected outside the temenos of the Twelve Gods between 490 BC and 480 BC, after a victory in the pentathlon at one of the

[120] Keesling 2003: 170. [121] Keesling 2003: 176.
[122] Paus. 1. 18. 3; 9. 32. 8. Cf. Kyle 1987: 198, A 12. [123] Shear 1935: 355–8.

Panhellenic games.[124] If so, the erection of such a monument at the center of Athens and Attica constituted a great honor.[125] Raubitschek's thesis nonetheless faces several difficulties. On stylistic grounds, the vase painting must be dated to before 490 BC at the earliest, but most of the details point to the end of the sixth century, which does not match the letter-forms of the inscription on the statue base, which belong to 490–470 BC.[126] Nor is there any evidence in the inscription or from what we know of Leagrus' life that the statue represented an athlete. Traces on the base show that the statue was anthropomorphic, but it might have represented a god or a mythological figure.[127] Moreover, Gadbery's study of the sanctuary of the Twelve Gods indicates that the most likely date for the erection of the statue was 480–470 BC, while the work of Brenne on the *ostraka* shows that it could not have existed before 480 BC. Consequently, Raubitschek's argument that the statue was destroyed during the Persian sack of 480 BC cannot be right. Lycurgus' claim that only statues of the Tyrannicides and of generals stood in the agora cannot be taken literally, since he fails to mention Demades. But his insistence on the lack of athlete statues speaks against the argument that in his time there was a dedication of this type by Leagrus there.[128]

3.3 Safe and unsafe honors

Sitêsis *and* proedria

If we leave aside statues and search for another type of reward, it becomes clear that there was no lack of public honors for athletes in Athens. To the contrary, Athens provides the best source from early classical times on this subject: the so-called prytaneion decree, which establishes who is worthy to receive the honor of *sitêsis* (free meals) in the prytaneion from the polis. The inscription is incomplete, making it difficult to recognize the groups of beneficiaries mentioned in the first half of the text, apart from the

[124] Raubitschek 1939: 155–64; *IG* I^3 951. See also Camp 2001: 35; Shapiro 2004: 6.
[125] Krumeich 1997: 68.
[126] Camp 1986: 46; Hurwit 1999: 71–3. Moreover, between Leagrus' birth (513–500 BC, according to Krumeich 1997: 64) and the date of the vase, there is little margin for his victory and the erection of the statue.
[127] Krumeich 1997: 68 believes that if the statue was a portrait of Leagrus, he is unlikely to have been represented as an athlete, since the inscription contains no reference to athletics. But in Athens, votive inscriptions of athletes were very brief and normally included no explicit mention of the athletic success.
[128] Gadbery 1992: 447–89; Brenne: 2001: 211; Lycurg. 1. 51. Raubitschek 1939: 163. For a different view, see Seaman 2002.

descendants of Harmodius and Aristogiton.[129] But the second half is less problematic and clearly states that winners in the four great Panhellenic games were rewarded with *sitêsis* as well as "other honors" that are left unspecified:

> [Those who have won at Olympia] or Delphi [or Isthmia] or N[emea, or shall win in the future,] shall have *sitêsis* in the prytaneion [and other honors] in addition to *sitêsis* according to the things [written on the stele] in the prytaneion. Also those who have won [a four-horse chariot race or a horse-]race at Olymp[ia or Delphi or Isthmia or Nemea], or shall win in the future, shall have [*sitêsis* according to the things] written on the stele.[130]

The restoration "other honors [*dôreai* or *timai*]" is generally accepted.[131] One of these honors might have been *proedria*, since Xenophanes already refers to the granting of *sitêsis* and *proedria* to athletes by the polis, and since in Athens *sitêsis* does not appear without *proedria* before Roman times.[132] Another possibility – which does not exclude the previous one – is a cash reward, which finds support in the 500 and 100 drachmas with which, according to Plutarch, Olympic and Isthmian victors were rewarded in Athens in Solon's time, as well as in the "precious object" for Olympic champions to which Xenophanes alludes, and the prize for an Olympic victory that allowed Cleombrotus of Sybaris to order a statue.[133]

Since the publication of an influential article by Wade-Gery suggesting that the prytaneion decree was proposed by Pericles before the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War, the inscription has often been attributed to the period 440/432 BC.[134] Thanks to the works of Mattingly and Tracy on "epigraphic hands," however, a date around 430 BC or even the early 420's BC seems more likely.[135] Allegedly, the decree was issued on account of a change in the laws regarding the granting of *sitêsis*; perhaps one or more of the categories of beneficiaries mentioned in the inscription (presumably

[129] It has been suggested that the first group of beneficiaries were Eleusinian officials (Ostwald 1951: 28–31; Thomson 1971: 228; Mattingly 1990: 114; Schmitt Pantel 1992: 148–9), the second the descendants of the Tyrannicides, and the third the *manteis* of Apollo (Ostwald 1951: 40–5; Thomson 1971: 233–5; Miller 1978: 140; Mattingly 1990: 114; although cf. Bloch 1953: 407–18). The final category, mentioned at the end of the decree, is the *stratêgoi*.

[130] This translation is based on *IG* I^3 131; cf. the translation by Miller 1978: 139–40, based on the text of Ostwald 1951: 25–6.

[131] *Timai*: Ostwald 1951: 26; *Dôreai: IG* I^3 131; Morrissey 1978: 125; Koerner 1993: 46; Pritchard 2012: 210

[132] Xenoph. fr. 2 West^2; Morrissey 1978: 124; Kyle 1987: 147; Pritchard 2012: 210.

[133] Plu. *Sol.* 23; Xenoph. fr. 2 West^2. Cleombrotus: Dubois 2002: no. 5

[134] Thus *IG* I^3 131. See also Thomson Wade-Gery 1932–1933: 123–6; Buhmann 1975: 111; Kyle 1987: 145; Schmitt Pantel 1992: 149; Mann 2001: 119; Miller 2012: 180 no. 221;

[135] Mattingly 1990: 110–34 (*ca.* 430 BC), followed by Gauthier 1991: n. 229; Gauthier 1993: n. 169. Rivolta 2014 dates it to the years immediately prior to 424 BC. Cf. Tracy (forthcoming) and *IG* I^3 302 (424/3 BC).

a total of five) did not enjoy this privilege before, or changes of another sort were made. But athletes do not seem to have been the group affected. Besides the fact that in the Greek polis, the habit of rewarding them with *sitêsis* goes back to the archaic age,[136] it is difficult to believe that the Athenians waited until *ca*. 430 BC to take this step. The inscription itself states that champions in the games (including hippic victors) are to be rewarded "according to the things written on the stele." This is not said of any of the other beneficiaries, which suggests that a norm that regulated the granting of *sitêsis* to victorious athletes existed even before the prytaneion decree was issued, and that the decree simply ratified it.[137] We also know of *sitêsis* for athletes in the period after the prytaneion decree. The most famous example involves Alcibiades' Olympic victory in the four-horse chariot race in 416 BC, about which Ps.-Andocides complains in the *Against Alcibiades*: "After behaving as I have described, he was rewarded with *sitêsis* in the prytaneion."[138]

Together with *proedria* and an honorific statue, *sitêsis* constituted what the Athenians called the "greatest honors" (*megistai timai*), those received posthumously by Harmodius and Aristogiton at the end of the sixth century or beginning of the fifth, and by Conon 100 years later.[139] If victorious Athenians at Olympia, Delphi, Isthmia, and Nemea were rewarded this way in the fifth century, why not with statues, as in other poleis?

The dangers of statues

In Chapter 2, Section 2.3, in the course of analyzing Solon's law regarding rewards for athletes, I suggested that some of the causes of this phenomenon lay in what a statue meant as a reward, as well as in the fact that athletes were controversial benefactors. The statue was a "dangerous" reward for the polis, since it showed the athlete in a position superior to that of other citizens and close to the gods. On the other hand, this was an ambivalent reward, in that – like the *epinikion* – it could be perceived as

[136] Xenoph. fr. 2 West^2.

[137] Thus already Morrissey 1978: 123. Most likely the situation of the *stratêgoi* gave rise to the decree, particularly if it was issued around 430 BC. While there is no evidence that *stratêgoi* were publicly honored in the first half of the fifth century, we know that as a result of the Peloponnesian War they became popular figures, a process that culminated in the granting of statues to Conon and other generals. After his victory at Pylos (425/4 BC), Cleon was rewarded with *sitêsis* and *proedria*, to which Aristophanes refers by saying "now if they (the *stratêgoi*) do not get *proedria* and *sitêsis*, they refuse to fight!" (*Eq.* 573–80).

[138] [And.] 4. 31 (tr. Maidment). See also Isoc. 16. 49. The award of *sitêsis* to athletes is also mentioned at Pl. *Ap.* 36d–e.

[139] Gauthier 1985: 77–9, 92–4, 120–2.

simultaneously a benefaction of the athlete, if he ordered it and appeared to be embellishing the polis.[140] Furthermore, like many benefactions, the statue could be perceived as a token of luxury and arrogance. Victorious athletes for their part could use athletic triumphs to acquire political influence, and in the worst case, to become tyrants. We know of a number of victorious athletes who assumed important military functions, headed colonizing expeditions, or led expansionist wars: after his Olympic victory in 720 BC, Orsippus was appointed general and enlarged the territory of Megara; Miltiades the Elder, winner in the four-horse chariot race at Olympia (548 BC?), led an expedition of Athenian colonists to the Chersonesus; in the battle of Ephesus in 499 BC, according to Herodotus, the Persians killed among other famous men "Eualcides, the general of the Eretrians, who had won crowns as victor in the lists and had been greatly lauded by Simonides of Ceos."[141] Olympic winners also commonly appear as leaders of embassies, for example, Leon of Sparta (victorious in the final third of the fifth century), Lichas of Sparta (victorious in 420 BC), and Antiochus of Lepreon (victorious in 400 BC?).[142] Dorieus of Rhodes, who took the prize in the pancration at Olympia in 432, 428, and 424 BC, led the anti-Athenian party in Rhodes until he was condemned to death by the Athenians and had to flee to Thurii.[143]

Buhmann rightly observes that it is unsurprising to find victorious athletes in such positions, since they were members of the elite, and political and military service was expected of them.[144] There can nonetheless be no doubt that athletic success was often used for political purposes. According to Thucydides, for example, Alcibiades tried to capitalize on his triumph at the Olympic games in 416 BC to win command of the Sicilian expedition from the assembly.[145] Victory in one of the great games could also serve as a platform for an attempt to install a tyrannical regime, as in the case of Cylon, an Olympic victor in 640 BC, whose bid to become tyrant is described by Herodotus.[146] Another story told by

[140] Kurke 1991.

[141] Orsippus: Paus. 1. 44. 1. Eualcides: Hdt. 5. 102. It is unclear whether this is the Eualcides whose statue Pausanias (6. 16. 6) saw in Olympia (Moretti 1957: no. 958 does not accept the identification). It is symptomatic that Herodotus (6. 36) also links the expedition of Miltiades to his Olympic victory: "Miltiades, who had ere now won a race of four-horse chariots at Olympia, took with him all Athenians who desired to share his enterprise" (tr. Godley).

[142] Leon: Moretti 1957: no. 332. Lichas: Moretti 1957: no. 339. Antiochus: Moretti 1957: no. 360.

[143] Moretti 1957: no. 322; Paus. 6. 7. 1 ff.; Th. 3. 8; 8. 35, 84; X. *HG* 1. 1. 2 ff.; 1. 5. 12, 19; D.S. 13. 38. 45.

[144] Buhmann 1975: 119 n. 7.

[145] Th. 6. 16 ff.

[146] Hdt. 5. 71 ff. As Kyle 1987: 20, observes, "apparently Cylon placed great store in his fame as an athlete and expected the Athenians to be more receptive because of his Olympic victory." Although this aspect of the "Cylonian affair" might have been distorted by the chronological gap that

Herodotus, although less historically plausible, also shows that tyranny was associated with athletic success: Cimon son of Stesagoras, after an Olympic victory in the four-horse chariot race in 532 BC, forced the herald to proclaim the name of Pisistratus instead of his own, and Pisistratus rewarded him with the right to return to Athens from exile.[147] The association of athletics and tyranny was due to the fact that athletic victory helped not only to make a tyrant but also to keep him in power. There are several examples of tyrants devoted to athletic success, particularly in Sicily.[148]

But a victor in the great games was a problematic figure, not only because he was potentially a tyrant but also because he was dedicated to an aristocratic activity. To spend time on training rather than work was a way to exhibit economic superiority; to participate in equestrian contests (above all the four-horse chariot race), which required enormous expenditure, exalted the victor even more. While ostentatious benefactions such as financing festivals or buildings clearly benefited the polis, not everybody agreed that this was the case with athletic victories. The criticisms of athletes voiced by Tyrtaeus and Xenophanes were discussed in a Chapter 2, Section 2.3,[149] and similar judgments are offered in classical Athens:

> I cannot approve the custom of the Greeks, who for these men's sakes call an assembly and pay them the honor of useless pleasures to grace a feast. What succor to his native town does a man bring who has won a crown for clever wrestling? or a man who is fleet of foot, or who can hurl the discus, or deal a neat blow on the jaw? Will they fight the enemy with discus in hand, or through the line of shields smite with the fist and cast the enemy forth from their native land? No man, when standing close to cold steel, commits such foolishness. It is meet, I think, that we should crown wise and good men with leaves; him, also, who guides the state most rightly, a man sober and just; him, too, who can avert evil deeds by eloquence, dispelling fights and factions. For such are the things that are good for the whole state, and for all Greeks.

Criticisms like these, from a fragment of Euripides' *Autolycus*,[150] are also found in Isocrates and Plato and are evidently based on Xenophanes'

separates Cylon from Herodotus, fifth-century Greeks perceived matters that way. See also Mann 2001: 66–7, Hornblower 2013: 210–11, and Papakonstantinou 2013: esp. 107, who add new arguments to this interpretation.

[147] Hdt. 6. 103. Cf. Papakonstantinou 2013.

[148] Mann 2001: 84, 236–8.

[149] Tyrt. fr. 12; Xenoph. fr. 2 West².

[150] Fr. 282. 13–28 ap. Ath. 10. 413c ff. The context is unknown, and it is accordingly impossible to know if the criticisms reflect Euripides' own opinions or those of a character with whom he might not have sympathized.

poem, as Athenaeus (the source of the latter) emphasizes.[151] This is a literary topos, but it preserves a sentiment that seems to have been shared by certain sectors of the Athenian population. And not only by intellectuals: as Mann observes, several ostraca that name the Alcmaeonid Megacles, winner in the four-horse chariot race at the Pythian games in 486 BC, refer to his activity with horses.[152] As Brenne notes, the best way to explain the Kerameikos ostraca that name Callias son of Didymias – the only pre-Hellenistic Athenian to achieve victories in all four great Panhellenic games – is similarly his athletic activity.[153]

In conclusion, it is easy to see why post-Cleisthenic Athens tried to avoid honoring victorious athletes with statues, which by intensifying the athlete's halo of exceptionality increased the risk that he would attempt to become a tyrant, and whose erection, conveniently orchestrated by the athlete himself, only augmented the community's sense of indebtedness. It is also understandable that a man devoted to an activity that others considered a sign of elite ostentation was not rewarded with an honor that might increase this perception even more. It may be that the athletes themselves, who in less democratic poleis would have been pleased to erect honorific statues in spots such as the agora, were in Athens unwilling to run this risk and preferred to limit themselves to dedications on the acropolis. It is probably for the same reason that there were few if any *epinikia* in Athens, because the honor brought problems similar to those aroused by a statue: exaltation of the honored person and ostentation.[154] Victorious athletes had to be rewarded; but the Athenians preferred to focus on less dangerous rewards such as *sitêsis, proedria*, and money. *Sitêsis* and *proedria*, moreover, involved becoming part of the community at the banquet, the theater, or sport events, integrating the victor more fully into the polis.

[151] Isoc. 4. 1–2; Pl. *Ap*. 36d–e.

[152] Brenne 2001: 226; Mann 2001: 87–8. These ostraca date from after Megacles' ostracism in 486 BC, just before his victory. In 471 BC, he was ostracized again; Mann suggests that his athletic success was responsible.

[153] See Brenne 2001: 176. The ostraca probably belong to a period when Callias was not yet 30. According to [And.] 4. 32, he was ultimately ostracized.

[154] Only two of Pindar's 45 *epinikia* are dedicated to Athenian athletes: *Pythian* 7 for Megacles and *Nemean* 2 for Timodemos. Neither was conceived for performance in Athens, and *Pythian* 7 was composed while Megacles was in exile. Bacchylides 10, an *epinikion* for an anonymous Athenian athlete and Euripides' *epinikion* (*PMG* 755) for Alcibiades are insufficient to dispel the impression that in Athens *epinikia* were rare. Kyle 1987: 117 and 195 A1 accepts restoration of the name of the athlete in Bacchylides 10 as "Aglaos"; but see Maehler 1982: 179; Irigoin, Duchemin, and Bardollet 2002: 157, 162. I see no hint in the poem of where it was performed. For the Euripidean ode, both Athens (Bowra 1960: 68) and Olympia (Angeli Bernardini 1992: 973–5) have been suggested; but see Mann 2001: 106.

Between 510 BC and the 480s, the Athenians erected a group of statues by Antenor in the agora in honor of the tyrannicides Harmodius and Aristogiton.[155] They surely followed the model of the statues athletes were allowed to erect in other poleis and at Olympia, and perhaps also the model of statues erected by athletes on the Athenian acropolis.[156] Already in 507/6 BC, the Athenians set up a monument inspired by the *agones* to commemorate an important event; it took the form of a four-horse group celebrating its victory over the Boeotians and the Chalcidians.[157] In 477/6 BC, after the Persian sack, Antenor's Tyrannicides were replaced by a set of statues by Critius and Nesiotes, the artists responsible for the athletic statue of Epicharinus.[158] The Roman copy of this monument shows a clear kinship with athletic representations.

Paradoxically, these works of athletic inspiration do not mark the beginning of a period in which athletes were honored with statues in Athens. Indeed, the group of Harmodius and Aristogiton made a notable contribution to preventing this from happening. Since the Tyrannicides were the heroes of the new Athenian regime, no other benefactor could be at their level, and the Athenians were accordingly reluctant to reward anyone with the same privilege. The prytaneion decree shows that at some point before or in the early 420's BC, the Athenians honored victorious athletes with at least one distinction that had been awarded posthumously to Harmodius and Aristogiton (*sitêsis*), and probably with a second one (*proedria*) as well. But judging from Xenophanes' testimony, these rewards were probably awarded already before the Tyrannicides.[159] Nor did they pose the same problems that statues entailed. The lack of honorific statues cannot be explained simply as a consequence of the introduction of the monument to Harmodius and Aristogiton; it is related to the more profound causes previously discussed.

At the beginning of the fourth century, Athenian generals were first granted statues, but these continued to be an unusual honor. Other citizens, including athletes, whose positions had not profited from the

[155] That this already happened in 510 BC, as Plin. *Nat*. 34. 17 assures us, seems to correspond to an attempt to make the date coincide with the foundation of the Roman Republic. In any case, several dates have been suggested up to the 480s BC (thus Raubitschek 1940: 58).

[156] There were athlete statues at Olympia at least from 544 BC, and we have evidence of their existence in poleis even earlier than this: the statues of Arrhachion (Paus. 8. 40. 1) and Cleombrotus (Dubois 2002: no. 5) from the first half of the sixth century. For Athens the evidence is more problematic, but the statue of Hipparchus son of Charmus (Lycurg. 1. 117) dates prior to 487 BC and seems to have been an athlete statue.

[157] Keesling 2003: 175. [158] Paus. 1. 23. 9; Raubitschek 1949: no. 120.

[159] *IG* I³ 131; Xenoph. fr. 2 West².

Peloponnesian War and the key position war came to occupy in Athenian society, continued to be excluded from this privilege for many years, despite receiving other honors. This was not the case with foreign benefactors, since erecting a statue in their honor entailed no risk. If the first benefactors to be rewarded with statues in Athens had not been symbolic figures such as Harmodius and Aristogiton, foreigners might have received statues even earlier. In fact, stelae with decrees in honor of foreigners do sometimes represent images of the honored persons.[160] In 393 BC, a statue was erected, together with the one for Conon, in honor of Evagoras of Cyprus,[161] and in the fourth century several statues for foreigners were set up. But until the late fourth century, Athens ordered no statues of athletes; the first was apparently that of the pancratiast Aristophon in Olympia (*ca.* 312 BC),[162] erected after the honor may had been extended to all types of citizens in addition to generals in approximately 330 BC.[163]

[160] E.g. Walbank 1978: nos. 39 (*IG* I³ 65) and 60 (*IG* I³ 1982).
[161] Isoc. 10. 57; Gauthier 1985: 97. On Evagoras' statue, see the discussion in Chapter 5, Section 2.1.
[162] Paus. 6. 13. 11; cf. *I. Olympia* 169; Moretti 1957: no. 484; Krumeich 1997: 201 no. 20; Seaman 2002: 107.
[163] Gauthier 1985: 103–9; cf. Din. 1. 13.

CHAPTER 4

Continuity and change (2): citizens

1 Patterns of civic benefaction in fifth-century Athens

The previous chapter was concerned with the relationship between the fifth-century polis and two of the three main groups of benefactors in the archaic polis: foreigners and athletes. I turn now to the third group, the city elite, who assumed positions of responsibility without monetary compensation and carried out substantial services for the community. In Athens, this group did not disappear with the transition from the archaic to the classical period, although it underwent changes, adding members of less distinguished families who had grown wealthy in the course of the fifth century. As in the archaic period, these benefactors were not honored for their services to the polis, but the demos compensated them with unofficial counter-gifts. Much more important, Athens controlled not only the honors but also the benefactions: the city limited their amount, where they could be executed, and their public recognition. Fifth-century Athens accordingly features a number of different patterns of benefaction and types of relationships between benefactors and the polis. Some benefactors continued the archaic tradition of helping individual citizens – above all those close to their *oikos* – as well as the community as a whole, through the assumption of liturgies. At least in the first third of the fifth century, they also performed economic benefactions outside the context of liturgies, for example, by financing construction projects. Most fifth-century benefactors, however, concentrated their efforts on performing liturgies, the type of service the polis preferred. Some individuals, finally, did not give money to the polis but channeled it from the polis to the demos in such a way that the demos appeared to be the recipient not of a benefaction but of a counter-gift, putting it in the position of the benefactor.

1.1 The archaic tradition

The best introduction to the study of citizen benefactions in fifth-century Athens is the following passages from Theopompus' *Philippica* (preserved

by Athenaeus) and the Ps.-Aristotelian *Constitution of Athens*. Athenaeus reports:

> [Hippias' and Hipparchus'] father Pisistratus, in fact, adopted a moderate attitude toward pleasure, and did not post guards in his fields or his orchards, according to Theopompus in Book XXI, but let anyone who wanted enter and enjoy them, and take whatever he needed. Later on Cimon imitated him and adopted the same policy. In his account of the latter in Book X of his *History of Philip*, Theopompus says: Cimon of Athens did not station guards to protect the crops in his fields or his orchards, allowing any citizens who wanted to enter them and pick the produce and take anything in his fields that they needed. In addition, he opened his house to everyone: a simple dinner sufficient for large numbers of people was always available, and Athens' poor came to his house, went inside, and ate. He also took care of the individuals who asked for something on an occasional basis, and the story goes that he was always accompanied by two or three young men who carried small change, and that he ordered them to hand it out, whenever someone approached him with a request. They also say that he contributed to funeral expenses, and often did the following: whenever he saw a citizen who was badly dressed, he ordered one of the young men accompanying him to trade clothes with the man. As a consequence of all this, he had a fine reputation and was their leading citizen.[1]

So, too, according to the *Athenaion Politeia*:

> Pericles first made service in the jury-courts a paid office, as a popular counter-measure against Cimon's wealth. For as Cimon had an estate large enough for a tyrant, in the first place he discharged the general public services in a brilliant manner, and moreover he supplied maintenance to a number of the members of his deme; for anyone of the Laciadae who liked could come to his house every day and have a moderate supply, and also all his farms were unfenced, to enable anyone who liked to avail himself of the harvest.[2]

Theophrastus, Nepos, Plutarch, and two scholia on Aristides say more or less the same thing about Cimon as Theopompus and Ps.-Aristotle do.[3] Thanks to Plutarch, we also know that fifth-century authors such as Cratinus and Gorgias referred to Cimon's liberality,[4] suggesting that this

[1] *FGrH* 115 F 89 and F 135 ap. Ath. 12. 532f–3c (tr. Olson). [2] [Arist.] *Ath.* 27. 2–3 (tr. Rackham).
[3] Thphr. fr. 515 Fortenbaugh (ap. Cic. *Off.* 2. 64); Nep. 5. 4; Plu. *Cim.* 10; *Per.* 9; scholia on Aristid. (Dindorf III 446, 517). Nepos, Plutarch, and the first scholion on Aristides seem to follow Theopompus, whereas Theophrastus and the second scholion follow Ps.-Aristotle. See Wade-Gery 1958: 237–9; Connor 1968: 30–2; Rhodes 1981: 338–9.
[4] Cratin. fr. 1 K–A and Gorg. 82 B 20 D–K ap. Plu. *Cim.* 10.

was an old and widely discussed topic.[5] As Rhodes observes, "Cimon's generosity should be accepted as a fact."[6]

As for Pisistratus' generosity, Theopompus' account seems suspicious at first glance, since what little he has to say coincides exactly with some of his remarks about Cimon, and it has been argued that the former report is merely a doublet of the latter.[7] But the fact that Ps.-Aristotle too links Cimon with Pisistratus, suggests that Theopompus' report of his behavior is not an arbitrary invention. Although Ps.-Aristotle does not mention Pisistratus explicitly, the coincidences with the passages from Theopompus[8] indicate that Ps.-Aristotle must have been thinking of Pisistratus when he wrote, "Cimon had an estate large enough for a tyrant."[9] Since Ps.-Aristotle seems not to have been inspired by Theopompus, nor Theopompus by Ps.-Aristotle,[10] both authors likely drew on a common fifth-century source[11] that compared Pisistratus' and Cimon's liberality as well as their methods of financing their actions. Some elements of this discussion were incorporated into Ps.-Aristotle's account, while the comparison led Theopompus to offer the same anecdotes about Pisistratus and Cimon in different places (a typical Theopompan technique).[12] We do not know why the common source spoke about Pisistratus' liberalities. But the more significant point is that already in the fifth century, it contained an image of Pisistratus' benefactions that coincided in essential points with Cimon's actions and made certain analogies possible.[13]

These analogies were justified, for Cimon's benefactions placed him in the tradition of archaic elites. Although I attempted to show in Chapter 2 that benefactions to individual citizens existed in the classical polis and

[5] According to Stein-Hölkeskamp 1999: 154, the anecdotes about Cimon's generosity in the fourth-century sources were closely connected with Cimon already in the fifth century.

[6] Rhodes 1981: 339. [7] Gottlieb 1963: 10; De Libero 1996: 79.

[8] The *Athenaion Politeia* also reports that Cimon offered daily meals at his home and left his fields unprotected.

[9] Cf. Connor 1968: 152 n. 9; Rhodes 1981: 340; Schmitt-Pantel 1992: 182–3.

[10] It is unlikely that the author of the *Athenaion Politeia* drew on Theopompus, since he is more precise than Theopompus when he describes the people who had lunch at Cimon's house, indicating that they were fellow demesmen (Laciadae). That Theopompus drew on Ps.-Aristotle is also unlikely, since his text is otherwise far more detailed. For the relation between the *Athenaion Politeia* and Theopompus, see Connor 1968: 108–10; Flower 1994: 192.

[11] Wade-Gery 1958: 236 n. 3, 237, thinks of Critias.

[12] Connor 1968: 32, 152 n. 30. The claim that Cimon imitated Pisistratus belongs to Athenaeus, not Theopompus.

[13] Connor 1968: 32 notes with surprise that "it seems strange that Cimon, usually thought of as a conservative and aristocrat, should show any resemblance to Pisistratus, the innovator and revolutionary."

could be regarded as benefactions to the community as a whole, I also argued that such benefactions were more typical of the archaic period. While in the classical period the benefactor ran the risk that his support of others might be interpreted as bribery or an attempt to buy votes, arousing opposition from individuals who resisted any form of dependence on a benefactor, in the archaic polis, there were fewer differences between private and public benefactions. Both private and public offerings were regarded as tokens of generosity toward other members of the community. In the case of Pisistratus, for example, the *Athenaion Politeia* argues that "both the notables and the men of the people were most of them willing for him to govern, since he won over the former by his hospitality and the latter by his assistance in their private affairs." Elsewhere, Ps.-Aristotle offers an example of such behavior: "he advanced loans on money to the poor for their industries, so that they might support themselves by farming."[14] But it is not only the fact that Cimon performed "private" benefactions that links him to the archaic tradition. His private benefactions included one that was especially archaic, the daily meals he provided for members of his deme, which represents a widening of the circle to which the *oikos* traditionally offered its services.[15]

While Theopompus attributes only private benefactions to Cimon, the *Athenaion Politeia* adds that "he discharged the general public services [liturgies] in a brilliant manner." Other sources reveal an engagement with the polis that went beyond liturgies: Cimon is said to have financed the construction of a portion of the Long Walls, planted trees in the agora, and embellished the Academy with gardens.[16] There are also signs that he participated in building the Stoa of the Herms in the northern part of the agora, as well as the Theseum.[17] All these services should be regarded as a continuation of archaic benefactions: the performance of liturgies, financing of construction, improvement of defensive systems, and embellishment of the city all contributed to the comfort and contentment of the

[14] [Arist.] *Ath.* 16. 2 (on the loans), 9. Nothing in this passage allows us to assume that the means to finance these loans came from taxes (cf. Stein-Hölkeskamp 1989: 146 n. 30). More convincing is the interpretation of De Libero 1996: 79, according to whom this was simply a case of aristocratic generosity.

[15] Theopompus refers to the Athenian people generally as beneficiaries of the meals. Ps.-Aristotle, by contrast, only mentions members of Cimon's deme (the Laciadae). Presumably Ps.-Aristotle's version is from the fifth-century source, while Theopompus' is an exaggeration.

[16] Plu. *Cim.* 13. 7–8. On the date of the beginning of the construction of the Long Walls and Cimon's possible involvement, cf. Constantakopoulou 2007: 142–4; Conwell 2008: 39–54 (*contra* Berkey 2010: 84).

[17] Judeich 1931: 73–4, 314, 352; Walker 1995: 55–8; Kopanias 2006: 159.

community in ways already practiced by archaic elites and tyrants. In the classical polis, such benefactions apparently did not cause the same problems as private benefactions, in that they were not regarded as a bribe, an attempt to purchase votes, or the like. But this does not mean that some were not problematic. Indeed, I will argue that several benefactions encountered serious difficulties in being accepted and were actually far more "archaic" than they appear.

Our information about early benefactors of democratic Athens does not end with Cimon. Although Plutarch's image of Themistocles is distorted by his attempt to present him as an ambitious man of undistinguished origins who lived beyond his means, some common ground Themistocles shared with Cimon can be discerned. According to Plutarch, who drew information from Simonides, Themistocles rebuilt the temple of his *genos*, the Lycomidae, in the deme of Phlya at his own expense and decorated it with frescoes.[18] This was not a public benefaction, but it was a significant service to the *genos* that displays a typically aristocratic philanthropic attitude. Themistocles also ordered that the temple of Artemis Aristoboule be constructed near his house in the deme of Melite. Artemis had been venerated in this spot since ancient times, and although the temple appears to have been a modest one, construction of it at a long-hallowed spot can only be seen as a service to the community.[19] In addition, Themistocles attempted to perform liturgies in a spectacular manner, leading to a victory as *chorêgos* in 476 BC. Plutarch quotes the commemorative inscription he set up: "Themistocles the Phrearrhian was *chorêgos*; Phrynichus was poet; Adeimantus was archon." Plutarch also ascribes to Themistocles a strong desire for money to cover his expenses, among which he mentions ostentatious sacrifices and a grandiose generosity toward his guests.[20]

Pisianax (who was perhaps Cimon's brother-in-law) may have financed a substantial part of the construction of the Stoa Poikile ("Painted Stoa"), which is dated on the basis of the associated pottery to between 475 BC and 450 BC, and which seems originally to have been named after him (Stoa Pisianacteios).[21] The law courts of Callias and Metiochus most likely also

[18] Plu. *Them*. 1.

[19] Plu. *Them*. 22. On the archaeological remains of the temple and the earlier existence of the cult, see Podlecki 1975: 174–6; Wycherley 1992: 209–10. The identification is controversial: cf. Munn 2006: 271–3.

[20] Plu. *Them*. 5.

[21] Wycherley 1957: 45; Davies 1971: 377; Camp 1986: 66, 69; Stansbury-O'Donnell 2005; Jung 2006: 109–10. It has also been argued that the funding came from the polis, but there is little evidence to substantiate this thesis (cf. Castriota 1992: 77–8).

got their names from the individuals who funded their construction – Callias son of Hipponicus was known as *lakkoploutos* – unless they were the *epistatai*, appointed by the state. Davies dates the construction of the structures to the 450s BC.[22]

Cimon's example, and to a lesser extent the data concerning Themistocles, Pisianax, Callias, and Metiochus, show that there were benefactors in early fifth-century Athens who resembled those of archaic times: members of the elite who, like their ancestors, attended to spheres of polis life that a "primitive" state could not. They did so by looking after individual citizens as well as the community in general, or simply after the *genos* to which they belonged, generously performing liturgies and financing temples, city walls, and the like. These benefactors were not typical of the fifth century, however, but belonged to a tradition that gradually disappeared as a consequence of larger political changes.

1.2 Gifts and (in)dependence

Attitudes

According to Plutarch, Athens in the 440s BC was marked by confrontations between the demos led by Pericles and "the few" (*oligoi*) led, after Cimon's death (*ca*. 450 BC), by Thucydides son of Melesias.[23] One of the main targets of Thucydides' criticisms was the impressive building program spearheaded by Pericles and financed with public funds, which according to Plutarch included the Parthenon, the Telesterion in Eleusis, fortifications, the Odeum, and the Propylaea:

> Thucydides and the orators that supported him kept denouncing Pericles for squandering the public moneys and annihilating the revenues. Pericles therefore asked the people in assembly whether they thought he had expended too much, and on their declaring that it was altogether too much, "Well then," said he, "let it not have been spent on your account, but mine, and I will make the inscriptions of dedication in my own name." When Pericles had said this, whether it was that they admired his magnanimity or vied with his ambition to get the glory of his works,

[22] Jacoby on Androtion *FGrH* 324 F 59; Davies 1981: 91 (cf. Davies 1971: 260, 308). It is tempting to see early fifth-century elements in Isocrates' reference to a "golden age" during which "the less well-to-do among the citizens" considered that "the prosperity of the rich was a guarantee of their own well-being," while "those who possessed wealth . . . regarding poverty among their fellow-citizens as their own disgrace, came to the rescue of the distresses of the poor, handing over lands to some at moderate rentals, sending out some to engage in commerce, and furnishing means to others to enter upon various occupations" (Isoc. 7. 31–6). But most likely the description refers to no specific historical period.

[23] Plu. *Per*. 11–14.

they cried out with a loud voice and bade him take freely from the public funds for this outlays, and to spare nothing whatsoever.[24]

That Pericles threatened the assembly in the way Plutarch describes is implausible, since he could never have assumed the enormous expenses of the building program. Nor is it clear that Pericles instigated all the projects Plutarch attributes to him.[25] The anecdote nonetheless seems to reflect something real and important for this investigation: the reluctance of the Athenian demos to accept donations for constructions if the works could be financed with public funds. There was in fact intense building activity in Athens in Pericles' time. This activity coincided with a tremendous availability of public funds, and nothing suggests that it was funded by private contributions like Cimon's.[26] But the fragmentary "springhouse decree" implies a situation that might be the origin of Plutarch's anecdote and that seems in any case to reflect the demos' reluctance to receive donations:[27] Pericles, or at least his sons Paralus and Xanthippus (Pericles' name is a restoration), offered to pay for something, most likely a new springhouse. The demos thanked them for the offer but chose instead to use public funds:

Let all the rest be as Nicoma[chus (proposed), but let praise be given to Pericles and Par]alus and Xanthippus and the sons [– They (the Prytaneis) shall spend (on the work) the money] which [is] paid into the tribute of the Athenians [after the goddess has from it] received her accustomed share.[28]

The origins of this attitude are linked to two important political processes in early fifth-century Athens, the consolidation of democracy and imperialism, as well as to the contradictions of gift-exchange. As Godelier points out, "by its very nature, gift-giving is an ambivalent practice which brings together or is capable of bringing together opposing emotions and forces. It can be, simultaneously or successively, an act of generosity or of violence."[29] A donation can cause humiliation, or as Godelier puts it, can function as an act of violence, as a result of the debt it generates. When the recipient is unable to reciprocate or can reciprocate only in a way that shows inferiority to the donor (a situation I hereafter denominate

[24] Plu. *Per.* 14. 1–2 (tr. Perrin, although, following Stadter 1989, I have replaced "party" with "supporters").
[25] Ameling 1985; Stadter 1989: 144; Will 2003: 309–401.
[26] See Davies 1993: 108–9; Blamire 2001: 100–101.
[27] Among scholars who share this opinion are Nippel 1982: 29; Stadter 1989: 181–2; Podlecki 1998: 86–7; Kallet 2003: 128–9.
[28] *IG* I^3 49 (tr. Fornara 1983: no. 117). [29] Godelier 1999: 12.

"asymmetrical exchange"), the donation can produce humiliation. This was the case for "clients" dependent on a member of the elite, who to reciprocate had to put themselves at the patron's service or, in extreme cases, even serve as his slaves (one of the problems Solon was forced to confront).[30]

At a collective level, the same was true of the demos in the archaic polis. As I argued earlier, the benefactions of the elite – an oligarchy or a tyrant and his cohort – contributed to the acceptance of elite privileges within the community. The development of democracy in Athens made the asymmetrical exchange between elite and demos less acceptable than it had been. Democracy entailed a reinforcement of the links between citizens and the polis and weakened personal links of a client type, which a good portion of the demos still maintained with members of the elite. The totality of the citizenship now began to be involved in governing the polis. The lowest strata of the population, the *thêtes*, were incorporated into the city's defense. Through allowances and other remunerations, the state became a hefty distributor of wealth. All these factors, together with economic growth that reduced the gap between the elite and the demos,[31] decreased the exchange of gifts, services, and favors between members of the elite and their "clientele," making it less natural and more difficult for these to be considered acceptable.[32] The exchange of services and counter-aid with fellow-citizens also proved that another relationship of reciprocity, one that involved no humiliation, was possible, simultaneously spreading the idea of *isonomia* ("equality before the law"), which was difficult to reconcile with the inequality inherent in asymmetrical exchange.[33]

Within this framework, being the object of donations must have been regarded with increasing unease. This was certainly the case for donations linked to a relation of "clientship," but it must also have been true of situations in which the gift merely evoked some degree of dependence. In Chapter 2, I mentioned several sources that refer in negative terms to gifts and the dependence they generated.[34] To these can be added the following passage from Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*, which provides evidence for a phenomenon analyzed in Chapter 1: the attempt by gift

[30] On this and other examples, see Millett 1989.
[31] French 1964: 107–9, 135–7; Gschnitzer: 1981; Raaflaub 1998b; Tiersch (forthcoming).
[32] Millett 1989, has shown that this type of exchange, which he calls "patronage," does not disappear in fifth-century Athens but does decrease dramatically. On its survival in the demes, see Jones 2004: 78–85 and Chapter 5, Section 3.3. On patronage in Athens in a naval context, see Potts 2011.
[33] On the relationship between *isonomia* and the decrease of patronage, see Millett 1989: 17–18, and his commentary on Arist. *Pol.* 1301^{a}29–31.
[34] Th. 2. 40. 4; X. *Cyr*. 5. 4. 32; *Ap*. 16.

recipients to use an excessive counter-gift to invert their uncomfortable situation of dependence by putting the other party in debt:

> [The great–souled man] is fond of conferring benefits but ashamed to receive them, because the former is a mark of superiority and the latter of inferiority. He returns a service done to him with interest, since this will put the original benefactor into his debt in turn, and make him the party benefited. The great-souled are thought to have a good memory for any benefit they have conferred, but a bad memory for those which they have received (since the recipient of a benefit is the inferior of his benefactor, whereas they desire to be superior); and to enjoy being reminded of the former but to dislike being reminded of the latter. . . . It is also characteristic of the great-souled man never to ask help from others, or only with reluctance, but to render aid willingly.[35]

The same posture of reluctance, or even a refusal to accept gifts, when being on the receiving end could imply or simply remind an individual of a situation of dependence, manifested itself also at a collective level, when the demos of the classical polis was confronted with gifts intended for the community. Benefactions by foreigners were unproblematic, since they were rewarded with honors and thus did not lead to an asymmetrical exchange. But the benefactions of members of the elite to their own community were different.

It is true that such benefactors, in contrast to archaic benefactors, did not generally enjoy political privileges that could give rise to the perception that their relationship with the demos represented a humiliating asymmetrical exchange of gifts by subordination. But the gifts were problematic for other reasons. Since they did not represent compensation for privileges, they put the demos even further in debt than the gifts of the archaic elite had. And for most of the fifth century, the lack of a system of rewards for citizen benefactors – as opposed to foreign benefactors, who were in fact compensated – meant that the demos had no means to cancel such debts. Apart from the absence of any tradition of rewarding citizens (for reasons explained in Chapter 2), this type of reward was of no interest to the demos. Honors were not a harmless counter-gift, for granting them to citizens would have transmitted the notion that the demos continued to be dependent on the elite. Nor were many members of the elite themselves likely much interested in honors. Instead, they may have wanted to prevent people who had made money as a result of recent economic growth from joining the elite via the performance of benefactions and official recognition of them as *euergesiai*.

[35] Arist. *EN* 1124^{b}9–18 (tr. Rackham).

Despite increasing work pointing to the diversity and richness of the funding sources of the Athenian state (through taxes, fees, fines, confiscations, leases, and gifts to the gods),[36] it still seems that Athenian imperialism was key to creating the material conditions that made rejecting the elite's gifts possible. The degree to which the tribute paid by the allies contributed to these circumstances is, admittedly, controversial. An important part of the puzzle has been challenged: that the construction of the Parthenon was chiefly financed through tribute.[37] As one of the authors of this line of inquiry observes, however, this does not imply that "tribute could not be said to be indirectly responsible for such things as the building program; certainly, since military expenses were covered largely by tribute, treasuries such as Athena's were available to meet other expenditures."[38] Moreover, subsequent surveys of fifth-century Athenian finances have concluded that direct access to the tribute was used (or even indispensable) to finance the building program and other areas of the democratic state.[39] But one does not have to agree with these interpretations to recognize that the empire provided gains that profoundly transformed the conditions of Athenian finances. As van Wees notes, "from 478/7 onwards, the Athenians conducted most of their wars without cost, while their well-funded campaigns produced profits of which the city enjoyed the lion's share." In addition to booty, Athens obtained "permanent imperial revenues" such as the earnings from the mainland and the mines of Thasos mentioned by Thucydides.[40] Although most of the evidence on tithes, indemnities, and cleruchies comes from a later period, it can be assumed that similar sources of revenue existed already in the early period of the Delian League.[41] In 431 BC, the treasury held 6,000 talents of silver coins, an impressive sum of money but one that, according to Thucydides, had in the past reached as much as 9,700 talents before decreasing as a result of building projects and the costs of Potidaea.[42]

[36] Cf. Kallet 2007; Rhodes 2013; van Wees 2013.

[37] Kallet-Marx 1989; Giovannini 1990; Giovannini 1997. This thesis has found wide acceptance: cf. Low 2008: 160–2; Marín Valdés 2008: 287.

[38] Kallet-Marx 1989: 266 n. 51.

[39] Samons 2000; Blamire 2001. See also Rhodes 2013 (although more cautious): the tribute benefited Athens both directly (by funding activities the city would otherwise have had to finance itself) and directly (through the sixtieths to the treasury of Athena), it being possible that after regular warfare against Persia ended, some of the tribute was dedicated to buildings.

[40] Van Wees 2013: 105–6; Thuc. 1. 101.3. See also Morris 2005: 41.

[41] Kallet-Marx 1989: 266.

[42] Thuc. 2. 13. 3. On the amount (as well as scholarship rejecting it), see Blamire 2001: 100; Morris 2005: 42; Malitz 2008: 28–9.

The hostility of the demos toward gifts from the elite must go back to the beginning of the democracy. But in 462 BC, it must have become more apparent than before. This was the year of the reforms that limited the powers of the Areopagus and reinforced those of the council of 500, the assembly, and the law courts.[43] One of the first decisions the demos took after the reforms of 462 BC was to ostracize Cimon (in 461 BC). Although Cimon was not ostracized for having been a benefactor of the polis, the fact that such a prominent benefactor had been exiled may have contributed, along with the increase in the demos' power, to the avoidance of such gifts, which thereafter came to be regarded as a risky mode of conducting politics.[44]

Alternatives to gifts

If the Athenian demos did not want gifts from the elite, how can we explain the existence of obligatory services and donations to the polis performed by a minority of citizens?[45] It is often assumed that liturgies were an invention of the democratic polis.[46] As I argued in Chapter 2, Section 2.2, however, there are reasons to believe that not only voluntary liturgies but also obligatory ones as well existed already in the archaic period. If this is correct, the liturgies of fifth-century Athens were a legacy of the pre-democratic past, when they were a perfectly comprehensible institution. The archaic polis was controlled by a minority of its citizens, but it also needed their contributions, which were vital to its functioning. Members of the archaic elite forced one another to shoulder the responsibility for benefactions sequentially to make their contributions more effective.

Liturgies would not have continued into the classical period if they openly contradicted the values of society in that period. But that was not the case. Up to the foundation of the Delian League, Athens needed the financial contributions of the elite, and until the "revolution" of 462 BC, this elite still held enormous power. Indeed, the situation was not much different from that in the archaic polis. In the 460s BC, economic and political conditions changed, but the demos, despite having new financial resources and decision-making power, had reason to sustain the liturgies. In contrast to voluntary donations that located the donor in a situation of superiority over the receiver, in the case of gifts made through liturgies, the demos occupied the dominant position, for it decided who made the gift,

[43] Hignett 1952: 193–213; Davies 1993: 63–75; Ober 1989: 76–80. [44] Millett 1998: 245.
[45] Davies 1981: 15, 33 calculates that the liturgical class included *ca.* 400 men in the fifth century.
[46] Christ 1990: 148, 150. For similar interpretations, see Millett 1998: 243–5.

as well as when and how. Although some liturgists happily assumed their obligations, liturgies were imposed by the demos on the elite. Most sources that refer to members of the elite performing liturgies against their will and being unhappy about them come from the late fifth and fourth centuries, when pressure on the liturgical class was intense, due at first to Athens' difficulties in the Peloponnesian War, and later to the loss of the empire.[47] But the Old Oligarch, who probably wrote around the time of the outbreak of the war, when this pressure did not yet exist,[48] already complained about liturgies.[49] Two institutions that date to before the Peloponnesian War also reflect the intrusive, coercive character of liturgies: the *antidosis*, designed to avoid "unfair" liturgies, and the practice of honoring benefactors with exemption (*ateleia*) from them.[50]

Given that the demos was composed mostly of individuals who, as Ober has shown, envied and resented the wealthy,[51] it is logical that it did not want to discard an institution that put it in a position of apparent superiority to the wealthy, even though liturgies simultaneously revealed the economic inferiority of the demos. Liturgists, for their part, used the institution to show off, to distance themselves from the masses, to compete among themselves and sometimes, as discussed in more detail in the next section, to put the demos in their debt and obtain political support. Liturgies thus also brought advantages to the elite, without whose involvement they would not have survived.

But how was the obligatory character of liturgies in classical Athens legitimated once this obligation was no longer imposed by the elite on itself but by the demos? Although an egalitarian spirit was widespread in democratic Athens and is easily discerned in the field of political rights and justice, the Athenians did not believe that they needed to dispossess the rich to reduce economic inequality among citizens.[52] They did believe, however, that everyone who enjoyed the advantages of being a member of the polis was obliged to contribute to its maintenance – this is among the

[47] Some examples: Lys. 20. 23; 21. 12; fr. 104 Carey; Ar. *Ra*. 1063–8; Isoc. 8. 128; 18. 59–60; [X.] *Smp*. 4. 30.

[48] It seems to have begun after the Sicilian disaster in 413 BC and the revolt of the allies in 412 BC; see Christ 1990: 151; Christ 2006: 159 n. 38.

[49] [X.] *Ath*. 1. 13.

[50] See Chapter 2, Section 2.2, where I argue that the *antidosis* may go back to the archaic period. According to Davies 1971: xxii n. 8, it dates at least from 502 BC; Christ 1990: 161, concurs. Exemption from liturgies was awarded to Harmodius and Aristogiton posthumously, or at least to their descendants (D. 20. 18, 29, 127 ff., 159), at the time of the erection of the statues of the Tyrannicides (before 480 BC) or in any case no later than the prytaneion decree.

[51] Ober 1989: 203–6.

[52] See Ober 1989: 192–226; Morris 2000: 132–3.

messages, for example, of Pericles' funeral oration[53] – and, as Herman points out, every citizen was expected to "contribute in direct proportion to his bodily abilities and economic means."[54] In Chapter 1, I argued that when the Greeks estimated the value of a gift, they took into consideration what it represented for the giver in terms of cost and effort. That the wealthy would contribute to the polis with liturgies, while the rest of the citizens contributed in a more modest fashion (by serving as soldiers, for example) was thus entirely reasonable and did not represent discrimination against the wealthy.

1.3 The new benefactors

After the reforms of 462 BC, Athens' elite seems to have stopped contributing to the polis in ways openly reminiscent of archaic patronage. We know of no one, at any rate, who gave money for construction projects or parks, as Cimon had done, even though this was a time of great building activity. But monetary benefactions did not disappear. The polis could not prevent liturgists from surpassing the limits of obligatory expenditure or from performing liturgies on a voluntary basis, and those who acted thus were naturally seen as benefactors. Liturgies accordingly became the primary arena for wealthy citizens to attempt to stand out as benefactors.

Services

Most individuals known to have succeeded as *chorêgoi* must have spent far more money than required to fulfill the liturgy: people such as Cleaenetus of Pandionis (normally identified as Cleon's father), who was victorious as *chorêgos* in the men's dithyramb at the Dionysia of 460/59 BC; Xenocles, victorious *chorêgos* for Aeschylus in tragedy at the Dionysia of 459/8 BC; Thrasybulus, victorious *chorêgos* in comedy for Cratinus' *Boukoloi* (probably before 430 BC) and in tragedy for Timotheus' *Alcmaeon* and *Alphesiboea* (at an unknown date); and Bion of Erechtheis, who funded a victory in the men's dithyramb at the Dionysia in 447/6 BC and probably also at the Dionysia in the previous year as *chorêgos* for a set of tragedies by Sophocles.[55] But Nicias seems to have been the most generous of these liturgists. According to Plutarch, he performed choregic and gymnastic liturgies, "outdoing in the costliness and elegance of these all his

[53] Th. 2. 35 ff. [54] Herman 1998: 220.

[55] Davies 1971: nos. 2866 (Bion), 3188 (Deinostratus), 7297 (Thrasybulus), 8674 (Cleaenetus), 11215 (Xenocles). See also nos. 3188, 3463, 3773, 5976, 7290.

predecessors and contemporaries, . . . For he was many times victorious with choruses, and was never defeated."[56] Plato refers to the many tripods Nicias and his brothers won and placed in the sanctuary of Dionysus,[57] and Plutarch says that in his time one could still see Nicias' "temple surmounted by choregic tripods in the precinct of Dionysus."[58] Among the liturgies Nicias performed, his *architheôria* to Delos seems to have left a special mark. The *architheôria* consisted of leading an embassy of citizens with offerings to a festival outside Athens; when the festival included choral performances, it also involved training and equipping a chorus.[59] To represent Athens in an impressive manner at the festival of Apollo on Delos was a particularly important way to disseminate the image and international reputation of the polis, and Nicias performed the liturgy in a notably magnificent fashion. Plutarch offers the following account:

> It is matter of record how splendid and worthy of the god his lavish outlays at Delos were. . . . When Nicias conducted the festal embassy, he landed on the neighboring island of Rhenea, with his chorus, sacrificial victims, and other equipment. Then, with the bridge of boats which he had brought along with him from Athens, where it had been made to measure and signally adorned with gildings and dyed stuffs and garlands and tapestries, he spanned during the night the channel between Rhenea and Delos, which is not wide. At dawn he led his procession in honor of the god, and his chorus arrayed in lavish splendor and singing as it marched, across the bridge.[60]

The only other Athenian from this period known to have carried out liturgies comparable to those of Nicias is Alcibiades. Plutarch records "his voluntary contributions of money, his support of public exhibitions, his unsurpassed munificence toward the city."[61] That Alcibiades assumed many liturgies, and in a spectacular manner, can be taken for granted. He reminds the audience of his splendid *chorêgiai* and other liturgies in Thucydides' version of the speech to the Athenian assembly in which he asserted his right to lead the expedition to Sicily.[62] The fact that Nicias in the previous speech tries to depict Alcibiades as a false benefactor, ready to risk the security of the polis to defray his great expenses,[63] probably indicates that many Athenians perceived Nicias as the opposite.

[56] Plu. *Nic.* 3. 2 (tr. Perrin). [57] Pl. *Grg.* 472a.
[58] Plu. *Nic.* 3. 2 (tr. Perrin). The remains to which Plutarch refers do not seem to be related to the choregic monument erected by Nicias son of Nicodemus in the fourth century. See Wilson 2000: 228–9; Titchener (forthcoming); cf. Geske 2005: 77–8.
[59] Wilson 2000: 44. [60] Plu. *Nic.* 3. 4–5 (tr. Perrin). [61] Plu. *Alc.* 16. 3 (tr. Perrin).
[62] Th. 6. 16. 3. [63] Th. 6. 12. 2.

In Isocrates' speech *Concerning the Team of Horses*, Alcibiades' son also mentions his father's services as *chorêgos*, gymnasiarch, and trierarch.[64]

Alcibiades' speech in Thucydides also refers to a benefaction that was, exceptionally, unrelated to a liturgy but in some ways similar to Nicias' *architheôria* to Delos: the performance of his chariot teams at Olympia. Like the *architheôria*, this benefaction was linked to promoting Athens' image as a powerful polis in the delicate context of the Peloponnesian War and was also the result of an extraordinary show of means. But it was in addition an ambiguous and problematic benefaction, because its force as personal promotion could not be excluded. The *architheôria* too had this dimension, but as a liturgy its nature as a service to the polis was unquestionable. Alcibiades mentions this benefaction because Nicias in his speech insinuates that Alcibiades wanted to go to Sicily only to enrich himself and be able to cover his expenses for raising horses.[65] But one also has the impression that Nicias mentions the horses not just to make clear that Alcibiades has many expenses but also because his performance at Olympia was widely understood to bring benefits to Athens, and Nicias needs to discredit him. Alcibiades' reaction confirms this impression:

> It belongs to me more than to others, Athenians, to have command – for I must begin with this, since Nicias has attacked me – and I think, too, that I am worthy of it. For those things for which I am railed at bring glory to my ancestors and myself, as well as advantage to my country. *For the Hellenes, who had previously hoped that our state had been exhausted by the war, conceived an idea of its greatness that even transcended its actual power by reason of the magnificence of my display as sacred deputy at Olympia*, because I entered seven chariots, a number that no private citizen had ever entered before, and won the first prize and the second and the 4th, and provided everything else in a style worthy of my victory. *For by general custom such things do indeed mean honor*, and from what is done men also infer power.[66]

Alcibiades' son, in the speech by Isocrates mentioned earlier, also draws attention to his father's intervention at Olympia, and he goes even further, trying to convince the audience that his father's performance was a service to the polis superior to his liturgies: "while the liturgies performed in Athens redound to the prestige, in the eyes of his fellow citizens, of the person who renders them, expenditures in the Olympian Festival, however, enhance the city's reputation throughout all Greece."[67]

[64] Isoc. 16. 35. [65] Th. 6. 12. 2. [66] Th. 6. 16. 2–3 (tr. Smith).

[67] Isoc. 16. 32 (tr. Van Hook). Athletic victories are presented as benefactions for the polis also in Lysias: "When he was in the cavalry, he not only procured handsome mounts, but also won victories

Political rewards

Services to the polis performed in the framework of liturgies were often rewarded with tokens of gratitude such as ovations in the assembly or, in the case of the *chorêgia*, in the theater. I discuss these reactions in Section 2.3. But before that, attention must be given to a more "sophisticated" reward, the one benefactors such as Nicias and Alcibiades aimed at: political support in the assembly. The exchange of benefactions for political support can be seen already in the relationship between Cimon and the Athenian demos. Gorgias claims that "Cimon made money that he might spend it, and spent it that he might be honored for it."[68] Theopompus tells us what he achieved this way: "As a consequence of all this, he had a high reputation and was their leading citizen."[69] Cimon thus became not only Athens' most prominent citizen but also its most politically powerful as well.[70] The *Athenaion Politeia* corroborates this interpretation of Cimon's benefactions, while indicating that he used them to compete against Pericles for the people's favor.[71] So too Plutarch in his idealized portrait of Cimon criticizes those who described his benefactions as "flattery of the rabble and demagogic art."[72]

For Nicias, the strategy of obtaining political support through benefactions was probably even more important than it was for Cimon. Nicias performed many liturgies. But he did not come from an old family, he lacked charisma, his political proposals were minimally attractive to the demos, and as a general he was often absent from Athens.[73] Plutarch reports:

> Nicias, since he was inferior in such matters [i.e. compared to Pericles], but was superior in wealth, sought by means of this to win the leadership of the people. And since he despaired of his ability to vie successfully with the versatile buffoonery by which Cleon catered to the pleasure of the Athenians, he tried to win over the people by choral and gymnastic exhibitions, and other such things, outdoing in the costliness and elegance of these all his predecessors and contemporaries.[74]

Alcibiades made similar use of benefactions. In the passage from his Sicilian expedition speech quoted earlier, he states clearly that they are

with race-horses at the Isthmus and Nemea, so that the city was proclaimed and he himself was crowned."

[68] Gorg. 82 B 20 D–K ap. Plu. *Cim.* 10. 5 (tr. Perrin).
[69] *FGrH* 115 F 89 and F 135 ap. Ath. 12. 532f–3c (tr. Olson).
[70] Connor 1971: 20.
[71] [Arist.] *Ath.* 27. 2–3.
[72] Plu. *Cim.* 10. 7.
[73] Davies 1971: 404; Nippel 1982: 69, 73; Ostwald 1986: 203, 294, 324–5; Welwei 1998: 174–5; Geske 2005: 9–14, 77, 82; Titchener (forthcoming).
[74] Plu. *Nic.* 3. 1–2 (tr. Perrin).

one of the reasons he deserves to be made commander. He begins by insisting that "it belongs to me more than to others, Athenians, to have command" and goes on to describe his services to Athens. He then adds the following to his list of services:

> And again, although whatever display I made in the city, by providing choruses or in any other way, naturally causes jealousy among my fellow-citizens, yet in the eyes of strangers this too gives an impression of strength. And that is no useless folly, when a man by his private expenditures benefits not himself only but also his state. Nor is it unfair, either, that one who has a high opinion of himself should refuse to be on an equality with others, since also when people fare ill no-one wants to take an equal share in their misfortune.[75]

Alcibiades' uninhibited way of seeking political power by virtue of his benefactions may seem surprising. It was one thing for the Athenian demos to unofficially exchange political power with members of the elite for benefactions, but a very different matter for a citizen to claim openly in the assembly that the polis owed him a political position because of such services.[76] There are nonetheless other examples of this behavior in classical Athens. At trials, for example, defendants often asked to be acquitted in return for their benefactions,[77] and Davies is certainly justified in asserting about this section of Alcibiades' speech that "we are entitled to infer that there had been a time when such a formulation would have been accepted without serious question."[78] But the passage also shows that benefactions were something of a gamble. Athenians who stood out on account of their generosity seem to have faced the same problem as Pindar's victorious athletes: the envy of fellow citizens, a greater risk in fifth-century Athens than in the archaic polis because of the institution of ostracism. The grandeur of Alcibiades' liturgies was in this sense more troublesome than Nicias' since Alcibiades' devotion to luxury must have offended many, whereas Nicias led an austere life.[79] In any event, what Connor calls "the politics of largesse" must have been exercised by other members of the fifth-century elite who performed liturgies and held political positions in close succession. The grandfather of the orator Andocides, for example, was a victorious *chorêgos* for comedy at the Dionysia in 447/6 BC, general and one of the signatories of the Thirty Years' Peace in 446/5 BC, one of the candidates at the *ostrakophoria* of 443 BC, and general again in 441/0 BC at Samos.[80]

[75] Th. 6. 16. 3–4 (tr. Smith). [76] Cf. Millett 1998: 245.
[77] E.g. Lys. 25. 12. For more examples, see Christ 2012: 72–7, 106–9. [78] Davies 1981: 98.
[79] Schmitt Pantel 1992: 196. [80] Connor 1971; Davies 1971: no. 828 V; Brenne 2001: no. 17.

1.4 The demos as benefactor

But the most successful Athenian politician of the time, Pericles, did not practice the "politics of largesse." We know that Pericles served as *chorêgos* for Aeschylus' *Persians* while he was still a young man (in 472 BC),[81] and he may have tried to make the donation recorded in the springhouse decree. But benefactions through *megaloprepeia* never constituted an important element of his political strategy.[82] Instead, Pericles' success was founded on his rhetorical skills, his integrity (visible when he surrendered his land to the polis at the beginning of the Peloponnesian War),[83] and his ability to promote measures beneficial to the demos, such as establishing cleruchies[84] and the 451/0 BC citizenship law.[85] Most interesting, not only did Pericles not rely on gifts to instill a feeling of indebtedness in the demos, but he also brought the demos money without indebting it to anyone, and even created a situation in which the demos assumed the role of benefactor rather than recipient.

The main source for Pericles' achievements in the field of benefactions is the Ps.-Aristotelian *Athenaion Politeia*. In a passage previously quoted, the text asserts that "Pericles first made service in the jury courts a paid office as a popular counter-measure against Cimon's wealth." After discussing Cimon's benefactions and the wealth that enabled him to perform them, it continues as follows:

> So as Pericles' means were insufficient for this lavishness, he took the advice of Damonides of Oea (who was believed to suggest to Pericles most of his measures, owing to which they afterwards ostracized him), since he was getting the worst of it with his private resources, to give the multitude what was their own, and he instituted payment for the jury courts.[86]

Plutarch's account is similar, although he paints Pericles as more of a demagogue and exaggerates his favors to the demos by adding to jury pay (*misthos*) other payments not actually introduced until later on.[87]

[81] *IG* II^2 2318. 9–11.

[82] As we have seen, it is not even clear whether the donation of the springhouse decree (*IG* I^3 49) was intended by Pericles himself or by his sons, and in any case the inscription reflects the fact that this type of donation was unwelcome.

[83] Th. 2. 13. Admittedly, his gesture was motivated not only by solidarity and patriotism but also, as Thucydides explains, by political calculation.

[84] Brunt 1966: 71–92; Figueira 2008: 442–7, 452–3, 456–9; Azoulay 2014a: 73–4.

[85] [Arist.] *Ath*. 26. 4; Arist. *Pol*. 1278^{a}34; Plu. *Per*. 37; Ael. *VH* 6. 10; fr. 68; Is. 8. 10; 12. 9; Aeschin. 1. 39.

[86] [Arist.] *Ath*. 27. 4 (tr. Rackham).

[87] Plu. *Per*. 9. 2–3: "In the beginning, as has been said, pitted as he was against the reputation of Cimon, he tried to ingratiate himself with the people. And since he was inferior in wealth and property, . . . Pericles, outdone in popular arts of this sort, had recourse to the distribution of the

What matters more is that payment for jury service was in fact established under Pericles, and it must have represented appreciable help to the poorest citizens[88] and have been designed (as the author of the *Athenaion Politeia* says) "to give the multitude what was their own" or (as Plutarch puts it) as "the distribution of the people's own wealth." Rather than receiving private money from an individual such as Cimon, that is to say, the poor received public money that, because of their citizen status, in a sense already belonged to them. The fact that they became the exclusive possessors of money they had previously shared with their fellow citizens did not indebt them, since this was compensation for a service. In that sense, jury pay was different from the money sometimes distributed among all citizens when the state had a surplus in its accounts (e.g., from exploiting mines),[89] for it was given only to those who fulfilled a particular service for the polis. As Schmitt Pantel points out, this should not be mistaken for a salary: "The *misthos* is not a salary but a type of counter-gift agreed to by the collectivity for whomever gave his time to it."[90] A mechanism was thus born, by means of which a significant portion of the demos obtained money in a way that made them feel more like benefactors than debtors.

The reason for the introduction of jury pay offered by the *Athenaion Politeia* and Plutarch – Pericles' lack of resources to compete against Cimon – is scarcely credible. As Schmitt Pantel suggests, this must be a fourth-century attempt to explain something that was by then no longer understood, or that some did not wish to be understood.[91] Pericles encouraged the reform above all because it was an important step toward democratizing the state, since it incorporated as judges individuals who could not have afforded to interrupt their work without economic compensation. But he must also have been aware of the financial and ideological implications of the reform for the poor who were unemployed or worked only occasionally. The innovation represented economic assistance of a different sort from patronage, a type of social relationship the demos increasingly rejected.

people's own wealth. This was on the advice of Damonides, of the deme Oea, as Aristotle has stated. And soon, what with festival grants and jurors' wages and other fees and largesses, he bribed the multitude and used them in opposition to the council of the Areopagus" (tr. Perrin).

[88] See Tiersch (forthcoming). [89] Nippel 1982: 32.

[90] Schmitt Pantel 1992: 196 (my translation; original in French).

[91] See Schmitt Pantel 1992: 193–4. See also Azoulay 2014a: 144.

According to Plutarch, Pericles had something similar in mind when he endorsed the building program. To those who criticized such projects, he responded with the argument that this was a way not only to improve the city but also to make public money available to a wide sector of Athenians.[92] Plutarch comments:

> In his desire that the unwarlike throng of common laborers should neither have no share at all in public receipts, nor yet get fees for laziness and idleness, he boldly suggested to the people projects for great constructions, and designs for works which would call many arts into play and involve long periods of time, in order that those who stayed at home, no less than the sailors or those on garrison duty or on campaign, might have a pretext for getting a beneficial share of the public wealth.[93]

Plutarch's interpretation may be anachronistic, but (as Stadter points out) it is also possible that he is following a fifth-century source directly or indirectly.[94] Behind the Periclean building program, at least as Plutarch describes it, seem to lurk some of the same ideas that inspired the introduction of jury pay: the use of public money to help the poorest citizens, but in a way that made them servants of the polis rather than an object of charity.

Plutarch's account, however, demands attention for another reason. Pericles defends Athens' right to appropriate the allies' money and use it for the building program, as compensation for protecting the allies from the Persians:

> Pericles would instruct the people that it owed no account of their moneys to the allies provided it carried on the war for them and kept off the Barbarians; "they provide", he argued, "not a horse or ship, or a hoplite, but only money; and this belongs, not to those who give it, but to those who take it, if only they furnish that for which they take it in pay. And it is but necessary that the city, once she is sufficiently equipped with all that is necessary for prosecuting the war, should apply her abundance to such works."[95]

The argument espoused by Plutarch's Pericles is linked to an idea that circulated in fifth-century Athens, that the Athenians were the benefactors

[92] Plu. *Per.* 12. 4: "And it is but meet that the city, when once she is sufficiently equipped with all that is necessary for prosecuting the war, should apply her abundance to such works as, by their completion, will bring that abundance into actual service, in that all sorts of activity and diversified demands arise, which rouse every art and stir every hand, and bring, as it were, the whole city under pay, so that she not only adorns, but supports herself as well from her own resources" (tr. Perrin).

[93] Plu. *Per.* 12. 5–6 (tr. Perrin). [94] Stadter 1989: 153. [95] Plu. *Per.* 12. 3–4 (tr. Perrin).

of Greece above all because of their role in the Persian Wars, and that this accomplishment entitled them to the empire. Thus the Athenian envoys to the Spartan assembly insisted, according to Thucydides:

> And at the same time we wish, as regards the general criticism that has been made against us, to show that we are rightfully in possession of what we have acquired, and that our city is not to be despised. Now, what need is there to speak about matters quite remote, whose only witnesses are the stories men hear rather than the eyes of those who will hear them told? But concerning the Persian War and all the other events of which you have personal knowledge, we must speak, even though it will be rather irksome to mention them, since they are always being paraded. For when we were performing those deeds the risk was taken for a common benefit.[96]

In the Melian dialogue, the Athenians refer to the same idea: "Well, then, we on our part will make use of no fair phrases, saying either that we hold sway justly because we overthrew the Persians, or that we now come against you because we are injured."[97] Later on, the Athenian Euphemus says in Camarina:

> As the Syracusan has attacked us, it is necessary to speak also about our empire, showing how rightly we hold it. . . . We have dominion, therefore, both because we are worthy of it – seeing that we furnished the largest fleet and unhesitating zeal toward the Hellenes, and that they, readily taking the course they did in the interest of the Persians, were doing us harm – and at the same time because we aimed at strength with which to resist the Peloponnesians.[98]

The clearest proof of the power of this way of thinking is found in Isocrates' *Panegyricus* (*ca.* 380 BC), which expands on the benefactions by Athens that justify its hegemony, highlighting the city's accomplishments in the Persian Wars.[99] But even more significant is the fact that Herodotus already presents Athens as the great benefactor of Greece in the wake of its service in the Persian Wars. Although he considers it necessary to apologize for this depiction ("here I am constrained perforce to declare an opinion which will be displeasing to most"), Herodotus explains in detail the Athenians' contributions and concludes: "But as it is, to say that the Athenians were the saviors of Hellas is to hit the truth."[100]

Despite the difficulty of determining how realistic Plutarch's account of Pericles is, in the Athens of his time there was certainly not only enough public money for the demos to avoid dependence on gifts from the elite but

[96] Th. 1. 73. 1–2 (tr. Smith). [97] Th. 5. 89 (tr. Smith). [98] Th. 6. 82. 1, 83.1 (tr. Smith).
[99] Isoc. 4. 67 ff. [100] Hdt. 7. 139 (tr. Godley).

also an ideology to justify the irregular way in which a great deal of this money was obtained through tribute paid by the members of the Delian League. The Athenians were the benefactors of Greece, and the empire and the benefits it brought could be perceived as counter-gifts. These ideas were part of Athens' propaganda in an international context in which the city had more and more enemies. But they also served to unite the community: in Athens, unlike in other poleis, everyone could feel himself a benefactor. Moreover, the Athenians created mechanisms to allow poorer citizens, who traditionally depended on help from the wealthy, to receive public money without giving up the sense that they too were benefactors. To the contrary, they felt themselves useful to the community.

Pericles seems to have played a leading role in promoting these ideas and measures, even though his claim in the Funeral Oration that "by this time the empire you hold is like a tyranny, which it may seem wrong to have assumed, but which certainly is dangerous to let go" might initially appear to contradict this interpretation.[101] Pericles' political success was probably due in part to his ability to understand how important it was to the demos to feel independent, as well as his discernment of the political benefits he could obtain by following a policy opposed, in a way, to the traditional politics of largesse. This does not mean that Pericles was merely a political opportunist, as Plutarch and the *Athenaion Politeia* suggest. Instead, he must have believed that one way to build a strong and self-sufficient polis like the one described in his speeches in Thucydides was to have a demos that felt economically indebted to no one, in Athens or elsewhere.

In fact, similar ideas may have been behind the system used to arrange public sacrifices, as described by Papazarkadas and Lambert.[102] Public sacrifices were funded from revenues from land or monetary capital belonging to a god or held by the community as representative of a god, specifically from rents paid by lessees of the land and from interest on loans. Individuals could donate land or money or contribute to the system as borrowers or renters. (Members of the liturgical class are overrepresented among tenants, and renting land could be understood as a sort of liturgy.) But this was indirect funding: "the system was, in an important sense, essentially collective and impersonal."[103] Despite the private funding, it presented the image of public funding. As the Old Oligarch says, the demos benefited ("it is impossible for

[101] Th. 2. 63. 2 (tr. Smith, with changes following Hornblower 1991: 337). The fact that it "may seem wrong to have assumed [it]," that is to say, that "in the opinion of mankind [it] may have been unjustly acquired" (Hornblower 1991: 337) does not mean that Pericles believed this was really the case.

[102] Papazarkadas 2011; Lambert forthcoming. [103] Lambert forthcoming: 9.

each of the poor to offer sacrifices"), but it owed this service to the polis: "the city sacrifices at public expense."[104]

2 Toward public honors

Pericles' alternative path to political success was followed to some degree by Cleon. Despite having the means to perform brilliant liturgies – his father was a victorious *chorêgos* in 460/59 BC[105] – Cleon did not try to gain political influence by spending money for the polis' benefit and instead presented a motion to increase jury pay to three obols.[106] But the support received by political benefactors like Cleon, as well as by practitioners of the politics of largesse like Nicias is not the only way fifth-century benefactors were rewarded. In this section, I discuss privileges that were not officially recognized as rewards, as well as prizes in liturgical competitions and "rudimentary" honors. These forms of recognition paved the way for the granting of typically euergetic honors to citizens in the time of the Peloponnesian War and especially in the fourth century.

Before that, however, it is necessary to consider the honors awarded posthumously to Harmodius and Aristogiton sometime between 510 BC and 480 BC. The award of these honors is important for three reasons: (a) It reminds us that long before this became a common practice, the Athenians had already taken a step toward honoring citizens other than athletes, and that all the pseudo-honors and proto-honors were given with the precedent of Harmodius and Aristogiton in mind, that is, in the knowledge that another type of reward was possible. (b) It shows that the custom of honoring citizens is the result of expanding the honors given to athletes; in other words, honors for athletes and honors to other citizens are linked. (c) It helps explain why the Athenians took so long to honor citizens. The precedent of honoring Harmodius and Aristogiton, because of the special circumstances that surrounded it, actually delayed the honoring of citizens rather than accelerating it.

2.1 Harmodius and Aristogiton

In 514 BC, two members of the elite, Harmodius and Aristogiton, decided to kill Hippias, the eldest son of Pisistratus and the tyrant of Athens, as well

[104] [X.] *Ath.* 2. 9–10 (tr. Marchant). On this passage, see Lambert forthcoming: 8–9. The reconstruction of the system, however, is based on fourth-century evidence.
[105] *IG* II² 2318. 33–4; see Davies 1971: no. 8674. [106] Ar. *Eq.* 50–2, 255, 797–800.

as his brother Hipparchus, at the Panathenaea festival. As Harmodius and Aristogiton were on their way to kill Hippias, who was on the acropolis waiting for the procession coming from the agora, they saw one of their accomplices talking with him. Thinking that they had been betrayed, they descended to the agora and murdered Hipparchus. Harmodius was immediately killed by Hipparchus' bodyguards, while Aristogiton was executed after being tortured.[107]

Following those events, at some point between the expulsion of Hippias in 510 BC and the 480s BC, the Athenians honored Harmodius and Aristogiton with the erection in the agora of statues made by Antenor. The Persians took the statues during the sack of the city in 480 BC, but the Athenians soon replaced them with a new group by Critius and Nesiotes.[108] Thanks to a late source and a fragment of the base of the group, we have part of the dedicatory epigram, which is attributed to Simonides and was probably commissioned for the second group rather than the first:[109]

A great light rose for the Athenians when Aristogiton and Harmodius killed Hipparchus
. . .
[? politically equal (? *isonomon*)] made their fatherland.[110]

The Athenians also awarded the descendants of Aristogiton and Harmodius free meals (*sitêsis*) in the prytaneion, and although we do not know whether this happened simultaneously with the erection of the statues or later, in Pericles' time or shortly after, the prytaneion decree ratified the right.[111] In addition, the descendants of the Tyrannicides were awarded *proedria* and exemption from liturgies.[112]

As noted in previous chapters, [113] statues, *sitêsis*, and *proedria* are typical honors with which the poleis rewarded athletes who brought home the glory of victory from Panhellenic games. The statues in particular linked the Tyrannicides with athletes, not only because athletes were the only mortals who had thus far enjoyed this honor, but also because both groups of Tyrannicides were modeled on athlete statues.[114] Since previously the

[107] Hdt. 5. 55; Th. 6. 56; [Arist.] *Ath.* 56–8.
[108] On the statues, see Bumke 2004: 131–45; Azoulay 2014b. [109] Taylor 1981: 71–4.
[110] "Simon." 131 Bergk = *FGE* 684–7 = *CEG* 430; Meritt 1936: 355–8 (inscription); Raaflaub 2003: 64 (reconstruction and translation).
[111] *IG* I^3 131. Many scholars attribute the decree to 440–432 BC, although some suggest *ca.* 430 BC or the early to mid 420's BC. See Chapter 3, Section 3.3.
[112] Is. 5. 47; D. 20. 127–30, 159. [113] See Chapter 2, Section 1.2; Chapter 3, Sections 2.1–2, 3.1–3.
[114] See Chapter 3, Section 3.3: The Athenians followed the model of the statues athletes were allowed to set up in other cities and at Olympia, and perhaps also the model of statues erected by athletes on the Athenian acropolis.

only citizens honored had been athletes, it was natural that the same symbolism be applied, and that Harmodius and Aristogiton too be regarded as benefactors.[115] They certainly enjoyed this status when the second group was set up (in 477/6 BC), as the text of the epigram shows, as well as when *sitêsis* and *proedria* were awarded to their descendants, but surely also when the first group was erected.

The Athenians had many reasons to honor Harmodius and Aristogiton in a way they had honored no citizen before (not even athletes) – and which they would not repeat until the fourth century. When the Antenor group was assembled, the reminiscences of the final years of Hippias' tyranny, which according to Herodotus and Thucydides were characterized by brutal repression,[116] were still very much present in the popular mind. As is normally the case with euergetic honors, the statues served not only to reward a benefaction but also to encourage new benefactions, that is, the killing of any new oppressors, and they thus represent a form of dissuasion against trying to establish a tyranny. In this sense, the statues had the same instrumental function as ostracism, which was introduced at about the same time. In a period when the democratic polis was still ill defined and, as events up to Pericles' time show, very different conceptions of what democracy should be existed, cultivating a negative image of tyranny helped identify the new system by contrast: the new polis regime was not a tyranny, and the statues were thus a symbol of democracy via opposition.[117]

But behind the statues and other honors bestowed on Harmodius and Aristogiton were also less noble reasons: the manipulation of collective memory to make the end of the tyranny appear to be the work of two Athenian heroes, when in reality – to the city's shame – it was brought about by the Athenians' great rivals, the Spartans. Despite the myth of Harmodius and Aristogiton, the Athenians never forgot what actually transpired. Herodotus already indicates that the assassination of Hipparchus by no means put an end to the tyranny: "After this the Athenians were subject for four years to a despotism not less but even more absolute than before."[118] Thucydides as well writes that in his time

[115] The choice of statues might also have been influenced by the possibility that Harmodius and Aristogiton, being dead, were soon perceived, like many athletes, as heroes or individuals of a half-divine nature; in the fourth century, in fact, they were the object of a civic cult ([Arist.] *Ath.* 58. 1). But the connection seems to be instead to their status as benefactors.

[116] Hdt. 5. 55; Th. 6. 53; see also [Arist.] *Ath.* 19. 1.

[117] Cf. Kallet 2003: 117.

[118] Hdt. 5. 55 (tr. Godley). See also Hdt. 6. 123 and [Arist.] *Ath.* 19. 1: "After this it began to come about that the tyranny was much harsher" (Rackham).

people knew "by tradition that the tyranny of Pisistratus and his sons . . . had been put down, not by themselves and Harmodius, but by the Lacedaemonians."[119] We can well imagine, then, why Harmodius and Aristogiton were honored. But why did the Athenians wait until the early fourth century to again honor a benefactor in the same way?[120] And why did *sitêsis* and *proedria* remain exceptional rewards for citizens outside the circle of athletes? It is logical that a polis that valued the equality of rights (*isonomia*) would attempt to avoid the emergence of a group of citizens with a special status. As was argued in Chapter 3, Section 3.3, statues were also dangerous rewards, since they could ease the way to tyranny. Harmodius and Aristogiton, however, were only honored posthumously, and the Athenians could have rewarded other individuals who sacrificed themselves for their homeland with statues that would serve as a stimulus to emulate their actions as well. But they failed to do so.

Throughout the fifth century, the Athenians regarded no other service to the polis as a benefaction equal to the one performed by the Tyrannicides. But the superior status of the benefaction of Harmodius and Aristogiton seems to have been the consequence – or a consequence – rather than the cause of the exceptional status of their honors. The state took care that no benefactor obtained the same recognition. Equating Harmodius and Aristogiton with other benefactors would have threatened their central place in the Athenian social imagination and, in that way, the possibility of achieving the objectives previously mentioned (manipulating collective memory, uniting the citizens in a common political project, and dissuading others from attempting to establish a tyranny). Moreover, removing Harmodius and Aristogiton from the lofty position in which they had been placed was dangerous, because they were actually controversial figures. The problem was not that their action had not brought the tyranny to an end – killing the tyrant was a benefaction, regardless of its consequences – but that there was speculation in fifth-century Athens that their motives had not been so honorable. This is Thucydides' version of the story:

> Now the daring deed of Aristogiton and Harmodius was undertaken on account of a love affair, and by relating this at some length I shall prove that neither the Hellenes at large nor even the Athenians themselves give an accurate account about

[119] Th. 6. 53 (tr. Smith). Herodotus' effort (6. 123) to show that the Alcmaeonidae deserved considerable credit for Hippias' expulsion, because they persuaded the Pythia to order the Spartans to free Athens, does not alter this fact.

[120] The first was Conon (D. 20. 70).

their own tyrants or about this incident. . . . And Harmodius, being then in the flower of youthful beauty, had as his lover Aristogiton, a citizen of the middle class. An attempt to seduce him having been made by Hipparchus son of Pisistratus without success, Harmodius denounced him to Aristogiton. And he in his love deeply resented it, and fearing the power of Hipparchus, lest he might take Harmodius by force, at once plotted, with such influence as he possessed, to overthrow the tyranny.[121]

In all likelihood, events did not transpire exactly as Thucydides narrates them, and alternative versions are preserved.[122] But from our modern perspective, it seems obvious that "the tyrannicide [was] an act of inter-aristocratic rivalry – whether over a love affair, educative influence, or family prestige – not of proto-populist sentiment."[123] That fact gave rise to versions at variance with the official one, which had circulated from the beginning,[124] in the same way that the recollection that it was in fact the Spartans who abolished the tyranny was transmitted orally. Aristogiton and Harmodius were thus benefactors as vulnerable as they were useful. Herodotus already reflects this vulnerability, although he does not mention the love affair: "in my judgment it was they (the Alcmaeonidae) who freed Athens much more than did Harmodius and Aristogiton."[125] The *raison d'état* recommended that the fewer rivals the Tyrannicides had, the better. The history of euergetic honors for citizens in Athens thus begins ironically, with the honoring of two false benefactors, who belonged more to the realm of myth than to the real world.[126]

2.2 *The problem of self-representation*

Statues

Pausanias reports that statues of Themistocles and Miltiades stood in the prytaneion.[127] Gisela Richter suggests that the Miltiades portrait in the National Museum of Ravenna (in her opinion, modeled on a Greek

[121] Th. 6. 54. 1–3 (tr. Smith). See also [Arist.] *Ath*. 18. 1–3.

[122] The *Athenaion Politeia* (18. 2) says that it was another son of Pisistratus, Thessalus, who fell in love with Harmodius. [Pl.] *Hipparch*. 229b–c, indicates as the cause of the incident that Hipparchus and Aristogiton were rivals in educating youths. Th. 6. 56. 1 and [Arist.] *Ath*. 18. 2 also claim that Hipparchus offended Harmodius' sister; according to [Pl.] *Hipparch*. 229c, this was wrongly regarded by most people as the main cause of the conflict.

[123] Wohl 1996: 39.

[124] Cf. Fornara 1968.

[125] Hdt. 6. 123 (tr. Godley). On this passage, see Raaflaub 2003: 68.

[126] It is thus revealing that the murder of Hipparchus is the only nominally historical event represented on Attic vases. See Hirsch 1925: 39 n. 1.

[127] Paus. 1. 18. 3.

original from *ca.* 450 BC, but now generally attributed to the fourth century[128]) and the Themistocles portrait in Ostia (reproducing a work allegedly from 470 to 460 BC[129]) may be copies of these statues. As was argued in Chapter 3, Section 3.1, however, after the Tyrannicides the Athenians honored no one with a statue until Conon in the fourth century. The display of statues of citizens in a place such as the prytaneion, "more than any other building the symbol of the city,"[130] could only have been the result of an honorific act of the polis. In addition, Demosthenes says explicitly that neither Themistocles nor Miltiades (nor anyone else) was honored with a statue in the fifth century:

> Take first Themistocles, who won the naval victory at Salamis, Miltiades, who commanded at Marathon, and many others, whose achievements were not on a level with those of our commanders today. Our ancestors did not put up bronze statues of these men, nor did they carry their regard for them to extremes.[131]

It thus seems likely that the statues of Miltiades and Themistocles in the prytaneion were produced in the fourth century, when it was customary to honor great men of the past this way.[132] The statues of Miltiades and Themistocles that according to the scholia on Aelius Aristides stood in the theater of Dionysus, probably belong to the same period (if not to the imperial period).[133] One nonetheless wonders if in Athens benefactors such as Miltiades and Themistocles were not allowed to have statues like those of athletes, which were something between private dedications and official rewards, that is to say, portraits of themselves with their names as dedicants, whether commissioned by themselves or by a third party. Although private dedications, such statues were considered a privilege, since they were manifestations of self-representation.[134]

Plutarch saw a statue of Themistocles in the temple of Artemis Aristoboule.[135] If this was the statue on which the copy from Ostia was based,[136] Themistocles himself might have erected it, given the estimated date of the original. This would make sense, since Themistocles built the

[128] Richter 1965: vol. 1, 95–6. Cf. Zanker 1995: 63–4; Despinis 2001: 110; Piekarski 2004: 67–8.
[129] Richter 1965: vol. 1, 98–9; Ridgeway 1970: 99; Podlecki 1975: 143–4; Krumeich 1997: 72–8; Schefold 1997: 36, 39, 41, 68, 88, 488; Despinis 2001; Bol 2004: 92–4; Marín Valdés 2008: 199–204.
[130] Miller 1978: 14. [131] D. 23. 196 (tr. Vince); cf. [D.] 13. 21.
[132] See Amandry 1961: 211–12; Loraux 1981: 163, 408 n. 132.
[133] Schol. Aristid. (Dindorf III 535). Cf. Richter 1955: vol. 4, 11; Krumeich 1997: 85–7, 148–9, 242–3; Marín Valdés 2008: 198.
[134] See Chapter 3, Section 3.2. [135] Plu. *Them.* 22. 2.
[136] Metzler 1971: 182–4; Schefold 1997: 88; Marín Valdés 2008: 199–204.

temple near his house in Melite. But Plutarch does not say whether an inscription identified Themistocles as the dedicant, and the dedicants might just as well have been his sons.[137] It is also possible that the copy at Ostia is based on an original from a monument of Themistocles in Magnesia,[138] in which case the statue Plutarch saw might date from the restoration of the temple of Artemis in the second half of the fourth century.[139]

Another possible (but equally problematic) case of self-representation is the famous statue of Pericles on the acropolis. Pausanias discusses the statue in two separate passages,[140] and it is most likely the one Pliny the Elder describes as a work of Cresilas.[141] Some Roman busts representing Pericles as *stratêgos* in a clear fifth-century style have been identified as copies of this statue.[142] In addition, we have a fragment of a statue base from the acropolis with the end of Cresilas' signature and of the name "-ikles."[143] But even if the base fragment belongs to Pericles' statue,[144] the ending is in the genitive, whereas in a dedication the name of the dedicant usually appears in the nominative ("X dedicated"). Most likely, therefore, as Raubitschek pointed out long ago, the statue was dedicated by one of Pericles' sons ("X son of Pericles dedicated"),[145] and this is not a case of self-representation.

A statue of Xanthippus, Pericles' father, also deserves attention. Pausanias saw on the acropolis a statue of this important figure, who contributed to the victory over the Persians at Mycale in 479 BC.[146] No certain Roman copy can be identified with this statue that would give us a clue for a date based on stylistic criteria.[147] It might belong to

[137] See Keesling 2003: They could have erected the statue when they came back to Athens after Themistocles' death and dedicated a painting with a representation of him on the acropolis (Paus. 1. 1. 2).

[138] Themistocles settled in Magnesia after he was ostracized from Athens. See Th. 1. 138. 5; Nep. 2. 10. 3. D.S. 11. 58. 1; Plu. *Them*. 32. 3. Cf. Richter 1965: vol. 1, 97, 99; Gauer 1968: 140, 149; Stieber 2004: 99.

[139] Keesling 2003: 180.

[140] Paus. 1. 25. 1, 28. 2. While it is possible that Pausanias refers to two different Pericles statues (cf. Podlecki 1998: 177), it is generally believed that he describes only one (see Richter 1965: 103–4; Lehmann and Kansteiner 2007a: 58).

[141] Plin. *Nat*. 34. 74.

[142] Richter 1965: figs. 432–3 and 435 (Vatican), 429–31 (British Museum), 440–1 (Berlin). For other possible copies, see figs. 429–47. See also Krumeich 1997: 118–25; Podlecki 1998: 177. Lehmann and Kansteiner 2007a: 57–8; Tracy 2009: 37–8.

[143] Raubitschek 1949: 131b = *IG* I^3 884.

[144] This has been considered unlikely: cf. Krumeich 1997: 125, 238; Keesling 2004; Lehmann and Kansteiner 2007a: 58.

[145] Raubitschek 1973–1974: 620–1; Keesling 2003: 194; Tracy 2009: 37.

[146] Paus. 1. 25. 1.

[147] Richter 1965: vol. 1, 101; Lehmann and Kansteiner 2007b: 49.

the fourth century, but Pericles might also have erected it in the fifth.[148] In that case, however, who would have appeared as dedicant?

Andocides refers to the story of a certain Diocleides, who reported that when he heard a group of men as he was passing the gateway of the theater of Dionysus by night, he "withdrew into the shadow and crouched down between the column and the *pedestal with the bronze statue of the* stratêgos *upon it*."[149] This statue must have been erected in the fifth century, since Andocides' speech was delivered in 399 BC and Diocleides' story relates to the mutilation of the herms just before the departure of the Sicilian expedition (in 415 BC).[150] Unfortunately, we know nothing about the dedicant.

Themistocles, Xanthippus, Pericles, and the anonymous theater *stratêgos* might all have enjoyed, as victorious athletes, the privilege of representing themselves. But the statue of Pericles on the acropolis, whose existence in the fifth century is almost guaranteed, certainly helped pave the way for the later honoring of generals with statues. This was an accurate portrait, which corresponded to a famous person easily identifiable even without a name in the dedication (and if the base fragment belongs to the statue, there was in any case a label, at least indirectly: the subject's name was contained in the words "the son of Pericles"). Technically this was not a reward by the polis. But the sensation it generated recalled the statues of victorious athletes and even of the Tyrannicides.

The paintings in the Stoa Poikile

A great benefactor of the city, recognizable by all Athenians even without an inscription, was also represented in the painting of the battle of Marathon in the Stoa Poikile, erected on the north side of the agora between 475 BC and 450 BC. In contrast to Pericles' statue, however, this representation has clear features of a reward. The benefactor was Miltiades, who according to Pausanias was the most conspicuous figure in the painting, along with Callimachus, the commander in chief.[151] Despite the prominence of Callimachus, who died in the fighting, if the portraits were considered an homage to those who played a special role at Marathon, they were clearly intended to pay tribute above all to Miltiades, the great protagonist of the battle.

[148] Ehrenberg 1954: 104; Gauer 1968: 141; Zanker 1995: 22–4, 31 (cf. Davison 2009: vol. 1, 410).
[149] And. 1. 38 (tr. Maidment). [150] On this statue, see Keesling 2003: 196.
[151] Paus. 1. 15. 3. Plin. *Nat.* 35. 57 mentions the portrait of another general, Cynaegirus, but does not say if it was in a position as prominent as those of Miltiades and Callimachus.

Since construction of the Stoa Poikile was financed with private money,[152] the paintings too were probably a private initiative. It is generally thought that the commission came from Miltiades' son Cimon, or from someone in his circle.[153] But even with private financing, the Stoa Poikile was a public building, and the paintings were a form of self-representation by the polis. The decorative program accordingly had to be approved by the people, who surely saw the paintings as a reward for those who fought at Marathon. Some of the combatants, such as Cynaegirus, Epizelus, and Aeschylus, deserved to be depicted, and it was accepted that Miltiades' contribution to the victory (and perhaps also the involvement of his relatives in the decoration of the *stoa*) meant that he would occupy a special place. As I have argued repeatedly elsewhere in this study, there was no contradiction in the public recognition of a benefactor being at the initiative of the benefactor himself or his entourage.

Aeschines' speech against Ctesiphon shows that, at least in the fourth century, the Athenians understood Miltiades' portrait as a reward by the polis. Referring to the Stoa Poikile, he says:

> The battle of Marathon is pictured there. Who then was the general? If you were asked this question you would all answer, "Miltiades." But his name is not written there. Why? Did he not ask for this reward? He did ask, but the people refused it; and instead of his name they permitted that he should be painted in the front rank, urging on his men.[154]

The anecdote is doubtless an invention by Aeschines, who was writing at a time when the suitability of the honors bestowed on statesmen and generals was the subject of debate in Athens.[155] To demonstrate that these honors were excessive, the orators not only referred to data that seem to be true, such as the absence of statues of Themistocles and Miltiades – it would have been difficult to deny their existence if they were visible – but made up plausible fictions. This is most likely also the origin of Plutarch's report that Miltiades requested an olive crown in the assembly after Marathon. Sophanes of Decelea supposedly responded: "When . . . , Miltiades, you have fought out alone a victory over the Barbarians, then demand to be honored alone too."[156] But however

[152] See this chapter, Section 1.1.

[153] Cf. Hölscher 1973: 74–6; Stein-Hölkeskamp 1989: 214–16; Robertson 1999: 168; Stansbury-O'Donnell 2005; Jung 2006: 109. The prominent position not only of Miltiades but also of Theseus links the painting with Cimon (Hölscher 1973: 75), as does the fact that, according to Plu. *Cim.* 4. 5–6, one of the artists – Polygnotus – was closely connected to Cimon's family.

[154] Aeschin. 3. 186 (tr. Adams).

[155] [D.] 13. 21–2; D. 20. 112–16; 23. 196.

[156] Plu. *Cim.* 8. 1 (tr. Perrin).

much invention it includes, Aeschines' anecdote suggests that for fourth-century Athenians – and we can safely include fifth-century Athenians as well – it was obvious that the portrait was an act of self-representation that only lacked a label and that, as such, it was a privilege and a reward.

Thanks to Pausanias, we know that the Athenians also rewarded Miltiades for his accomplishments at Marathon with a portrait in a statue group erected at Delphi at some point after his death.[157] Miltiades appeared in the group along with heroes and gods, and his name figured in the dedication. In contrast to the paintings in the Stoa Poikile, this work was commissioned and paid for by the polis and was dedicated as a tithe from the spoils of Marathon. This is a reward close to the sculptures of the Tyrannicides, the most significant difference being that the group was set up at Delphi; the Athenians would never have dared to place anything of the sort in the agora. Nameless portraits, private dedications that emulated the statues of athletes, and honorific statues outside Athens were all ways of paying homage to great men. But they were different from the statues of the Tyrannicides.

2.3 Between prize and reward

The path toward euergetic honors was not smoothed only by the sculptural and pictorial rewards and pseudo-rewards. Prizes (*athla*) also played a role. In principle, these were recompenses different from the unofficial rewards for benefactions and euergetic honors. They were awards for victories in competitions, trophies, objects "captured" by defeating rather than indebting others. Theoretically they had nothing to do with counter-gifts. In practice, however, the distinction between prizes and rewards for benefactions was less clear. Prizes were sometimes awarded to individuals engaged in activities that constituted services to the polis, such as fighting for it on the battlefield or financing a chorus for a musical performance. In such cases, although the winner obtained the prize for being the best, this was inevitably also perceived as a reward for the service rendered to the polis. The winner managed to be the only one compensated for a service for which the other competitors, or at least some of them, should also have been rewarded, although they had not come out on top.

[157] Paus. 10. 10. 1. See Rouse 1902: 131; Despinis 2001.

Awards of valor

There is scattered evidence for awards of valor (*aristeia*) not only from Athens but also from other places in the Greek world.[158] The main source of information is Herodotus. From what we can reconstruct, awards of valor were granted to the outstanding combatant in the contingent of a polis or a coalition of poleis. In the Persian Wars, it was common to award a similar prize to the outstanding polis. The awards were of different kinds: a eulogy before the army assembled after the battle, crowns, money, or perhaps a share of the booty.[159] In Athens, the regular award seems to have been a crown.[160] In the discussion of war in Plato's *Republic*, Socrates stresses the importance of the ritual of crowning the soldier who won the prize:

> And don't you agree that the one who wins the prize of valour and distinguishes himself shall first be crowned by his fellows in the campaign, by the lads and boys each in turn?[161]

Herodotus reports that at the battle of Artemisium in 480 BC, "the first Greek to take an enemy ship was an Athenian, Lycomedes son of Aeschraeus, and it was he who received the prize for valour."[162] Plato, Isocrates, and Plutarch inform us about the award of valor won by Alcibiades at the battle of Potidaea in 432 BC – a controversial decision, since some thought that, in reality, it was Socrates who deserved the award.[163] But the most famous prize for valor is the one Themistocles should have obtained after the battle of Salamis in 480 BC, when (according to Herodotus) envy led all the other generals to vote for themselves, although the majority put Themistocles in second place.[164]

The most interesting point about Themistocles' lost prize, is how Herodotus continues the story, after reporting that the Greeks went back to their poleis without having determined a winner. Themistocles traveled to Sparta with the intention of obtaining the honor he did not get from the men who fought with him at Salamis. There "the Lacedaemonians made him welcome and paid him high honor"; bestowed an olive crown on him for his wisdom (*sophiê*) and cleverness (*dexiotês*); and "gave him the finest chariot in Sparta; and with many words of praise, they sent him on his homeward way with the 300 picked men of Sparta who are called Knights

[158] For the evidence, see Pritchett 1974: 276–90. [159] Pritchett 1974: 289.
[160] Pritchett 1974: 290. [161] Pl. *R.* 468b (tr. Shorey). [162] Hdt. 8. 11 (tr. Godley).
[163] Pl. *Smp.* 220d; Isoc. 16. 28; Plu. *Alc.* 7.
[164] Hdt. 8. 123. Cf. Blösel 2004: 321–3, on several aspects of the account that do not seem to be factual. See also Plu. *Them.* 7.

to escort him as far as the borders of Tegea."[165] Herodotus' account has many peculiar aspects, if one attempts to understand it as evidence for the award of a historical prize of valor to Themistocles: a polis did not normally grant within its territory a prize that should have been awarded by all the Greek allies;[166] the crown was not a prize of valor but a reward for wisdom and cleverness (a situation unparalleled elsewhere);[167] other honors are mentioned as well, such as the encomium, chariot, and escort. As Diodorus Siculus points out, the Spartans "honoured Themistocles with double the number of gifts awarded to those who had received the prize of valour."[168] The impression is that he was in fact rewarded as a benefactor; as Blösel observes, "it is conceivable that the Spartans were showing appreciation for the *sophiê* of Themistocles that spared them from having to fight for their country."[169] In this story, prizes for the winner in a contest and rewards for benefactions are jumbled together. They appear in a continuum, in which it is difficult to distinguish the dividing line. This may be only the result of Herodotus' reconstruction of events. But perhaps in the Spartan mental universe in 480 BC, the difference between prizes and counter-gifts was actually obscure.

Prizes for liturgists

Competitions linked to liturgies also offered the possibility of obtaining honors. Most of our information relates to the *chorêgia*. The victorious *chorêgos* was awarded a crown[170] and had his name solemnly proclaimed in the theater.[171] During the procession from the theater to the venue of the victory celebration, he was congratulated, given victory ribbons, and covered with flower petals.[172] His name was added to the victory lists and appeared in votive inscriptions.[173] Although he shared the honor of the victory with the poet and the members of the chorus, the winning *chorêgos* was in the foreground. At the dithyrambic competitions, he received the

[165] Hdt. 8. 124 (tr. Godley).
[166] See Jordan 1988: 549. By contrast, there was nothing strange about the *aristeion* bestowed at the same time on a Spartan, Eurybiades; it was simply the prize for the most courageous Spartan (Hdt. 8. 124. 2).
[167] Jordan 1988: 549. [168] D.S. 11. 27. 3 (tr. Oldfather).
[169] Blösel 2004: 324 (my translation: original text in German).
[170] Cf. Gauthier 1985: 118; Wilson 2000: 102. It is unclear whether the crown was among the official prizes (Reisch 1899: 2412) or was given at the private celebration (MacDowell 1990: 275), but the former seems more likely (Gauthier 1985: 118; Wilson 2000: 102–3).
[171] D. 21. 55, 64. [172] Wilson 2000: 102.
[173] For the sources, see Mette 1977; Wilson 2000: 214–16. An example is the inscription dedicated by Themistocles in 476 referred to in this chapter, Section 1.1: "Themistocles the Phrearrhian was *chorêgos*; Phrynichus was poet; Adeimantus was archon" (cf. Plu. *Them.* 5. 3).

prize (a tripod) and was given the privilege of displaying it in an appropriate location.[174] In the so-called *Fasti* – victory lists for the years 473/2–329/8 BC – his name appears in the records of the comic and tragic competitions before the poet's, and in the case of the dithyrambic competitions he alone is mentioned.[175] Last but not least, it was normally the *chorêgos* who arranged the victory celebration, an informal extension of his duties as liturgist but also a privilege that characterized him as a winner.[176] All these honors are reminiscent of those bestowed on the victorious athlete, who (as discussed in Chapter 2, Section 2.1) was recognized as not only a winner but also a benefactor. When the Athenians saw a triumphant *chorêgos* honored, therefore, the association with the athlete benefactor must have been immediate, and they must have realized that although the *chorêgos* was honored with prizes rather than counter-gifts, he too was a benefactor of the polis.

Gymnasiarchs were also awarded honors in case of victory.[177] Although we have little information from the fifth century, literary sources and inscriptions suggest that gymnasiarchs enjoyed a prominent position. Dedications and honorific inscriptions mention first the gymnasiarch and then the individual torch runners (*lampadêphoroi*),[178] or simply the *phylê* and the gymnasiarch[179] (in which case the gymnasiarch may appear before the *phylê*).[180] How a gymnasiarch might capitalize on a victory can be seen in the way a client of Lysias refers to his service in 405/4 BC: "I was producing games for the Promethea, and I won a victory after spending twelve minae."[181]

The *chorêgiai* and the *gymnasiarchiai* were so closely linked with prizes that it must have seemed natural to introduce prizes for another liturgy, the

[174] *IG* I³ 833 bis and "Simon." *FGE* 792–5 might be understood as a reaction of the poets against the prominent position of the *chorêgos* (cf. Wilson 2000: 217–18).

[175] For example, *IG* II² 2318. 121–2. Cf. Millis and Olson 2012.

[176] The poet might also organize the victory celebration; a well-known example is Agathon's celebration in Plato's *Symposium*.

[177] The Athenian gymnasiarchy of the fifth and fourth centuries was a liturgy that consisted of equipping and training runners for torch-racing competitions at the Great Panathenaea, Hephaestea, Promethea, and festivals of Pan. Cf. *IG* I³ 82 (421); And. 1. 132; D. 20. 21; Oehler 1912: 1987–8; Jüthner 1924: 575; Sekunda 1990: 149–58.

[178] *IG* II² 3105 (= Pouilloux 1954: 111 no. 2 = Reinmuth 1971: 51–2 no. 13) + *SEG* XXXI 162, probably from 333/32 (Palagia and Lewis 1989; other dates are suggested by Pouilloux 1954: 112; Reinmuth 1971: 51, 53; Sekunda 1990: 155). See also *IG* II² 1250.

[179] *IG* II² 3017 (first half of the fourth century); 3019 (346/5 BC; victory of the tribe Acamantis under the gymnasiarch Xenocles); 3020 (mid-fourth century).

[180] *IG* I³ 969 bis, b of 425/00 BC (cf. *SEG* XXX 125): *[Kall]ias Têlokl[eos] egymnasiarche. Pandionis enika*. See also *IG* II² 3021 (mid-fourth century) and 3023 (338/7 BC, a dedication by the gymnasiarch of the tribe Cecropis).

[181] Lys. 21. 3 (tr. Lamb).

triêrarchia, that had nothing to do with an official competition. On the one hand, these awards were of course intended to promote competition among the trierarchs and thus increase their contributions. On the other hand, they were a consequence of preexisting competition among liturgists, who endeavored to prepare their own warships as quickly and splendidly as possible. Thus Thucydides, discussing how the fleet for the Sicilian expedition was built up, refers to

> the trierarchs giving bounties to the *thranitae* [rowers with the longest oars] or uppermost bench of the sailors in addition to the pay from the state, and using, besides, figure-heads and equipments that were very expensive; for each one strove to the utmost that his own ship should excel all others both in fine appearance and in swiftness of sailing.[182]

Such competition deserved prizes, and although our evidence is all from the fourth century, trierarch prizes might have existed in the fifth.[183] In 360/59 BC, a popular decree awarded a crown to the first trierarch to have his ship ready for an expedition to the Hellespont. A debate apparently arose about who the winner was, and Demosthenes presents the arguments of one trierarch – probably the orator himself – who claimed the crown.[184] Further evidence comes from a decree of 325/4 BC, on the occasion of a colonial mission to the Adriatic coast that offered gold crowns weighing 500, 300, and 200 drachmas to the first three trierarchs to furnish their ships; the winners were to be proclaimed at the Thargelia.[185] The result of introducing such prizes was to produce liturgies that – in contrast to choregies and gymnasiarchies – were not a means to organize competitions but an object of competition themselves. The successful liturgist thus became the sole winner and was not forced to share the victory with a poet, athletes, or the like.

The prizes liturgists obtained recognized their contributions to an athletic or musical victory or an outstanding achievement of another kind, such as equipping a warship better or more rapidly than others. They were not prizes for spending more money per se. Nonetheless, victory depended to a considerable extent on the amount of money invested, and the winner was routinely the man who spent the most, or at least one of those who spent the most. The client of Lysias cited earlier, in an attempt to convince the jury of his generosity, accordingly lists not only the amounts he spent on choregies but his victories: in 411/10 BC, he spent

[182] Th. 6. 31. 3 (tr. Smith). [183] Gauthier 1985: 118.
[184] D. 51. See Davies 1971: 135–6; Sealey 1993: 100; MacDowell 2009: 133–6.
[185] *IG* II³ 370 = RO 100.

2,000 drachmas at the Thargelia and obtained the victory; in 410/9 BC, he spent 5,000 drachmas at the Dionysia and won again; and so forth. Mentioning that his choruses won served not only to impress the jury but also as a measure of his generosity, the message being that he spent enough money to take first place – that is, a lot.[186] Being the victor in a contest financed through liturgies required such enormous expense that the award was regarded simultaneously as a prize and a reward for generosity, as compensation for a great service. Thus Demosthenes mentions as an important consideration for obtaining the trierarchic crown the fact that he spent more than his rivals.[187] This should not really have been a criterion for victory. But in a context in which prizes and rewards overlapped, the argument could be made: How could the man who spent the most end up without the prize? The three trierarchs victorious in the competition convened on the occasion of the colonizing expedition are treated as benefactors. They are crowned "so that the love of honor (*philotimia*) of the trierarchs towards the people may be apparent."[188]

This reward component helps explain the establishment of prizes for trierarchies. Such prizes were a consequence not only of the agonistic mentality of the Greeks, their obsession with transforming anything into a competition, but also of the fact that they made it possible to compensate generous trierarchs, who deserved at least the same opportunity to be compensated as a *chorêgos*. The system was admittedly imperfect, given that many trierarchs spent large amounts of money but did not receive a prize. For that reason, real rewards eventually were instituted, as I discuss next.

2.4 *Early honors*

After the Persian Wars, the Athenians set up a monument to honor the men who fought at Marathon and Salamis; two of the epigrams are preserved. The type of monument (perhaps a herm) and the battle or battles to which the epigrams refer (only Marathon? only Salamis? Salamis in one epigram, and Marathon in the other?) are much debated, as are the dates of the epigrams.[189] What matters for my purposes is that the

[186] Lys. 21. 1. ff.

[187] D. 51. 5–6: "As to the ship's equipment, moreover, all, that is, which the state is bound to supply to the trierarchs, I purchased it with my own resources and took nothing from the public stores, while these men used equipment of yours and spent none of their own money for this purpose. . . . More than this, I secured the very best rowers, giving by far the highest wages."

[188] *IG* II^3 370 (tr. Lambert *AIO*).

[189] See the bibliography in Fornara 1983: 51; Jung 2006.

Athenians chose to reward a group of citizens who had rendered a great service. In contrast to the rewards discussed in the previous sections, this is an official honor granted by the demos:

> These men's courage [-9- imperishable] forever,
> [– gods grant].
> For they checked, as foot soldiers [and on swift-faring ships]
> all of Hellas from [witnessing the day] of slavery.
>
> They truly possessed an *adamantine* ("spirit in their breast") when the spear
> was poised in front of the gates in the face of [—]
> [who wished] to burn the sea-girt [—]
> city, turning back by force the Persian [power].[190]

The epigrams leave no doubt that they were a collective reward in which no individual was distinguished. At this early stage of the history of honoring citizens in Athens, the polis was cautious. This soon changed, but only slightly, without really entering into contradiction with the egalitarian philosophy of the time.

In the aftermath of the Persian Wars, in 475 BC, an Athenian contingent captured the city of Eion on the Strymon River.[191] The commanders, Cimon among them, were awarded the honor of setting up three herms with epigrams. Aeschines offers a version of this event that, as often in fourth-century orators, relates it to a negotiation between the polis and the honorands about adequate honors:

> When they came home they asked the people for a reward, and the democracy gave them great honour, as it was then esteemed – permission to set up three stone herms in the Stoa of the Herms, but on condition that they should not inscribe their own names upon them, in order that the inscription might not seem to be in honour of the generals, but of the people.[192]

The reaction of the demos should be understood as an anachronism. Aeschines offers this anecdote to contrast the demanding attitude of the fifth-century demos with the laxity with which honors were granted in his own day.[193] But the inscribed verses, transmitted by both Aeschines and Plutarch, seem authentic.[194] Of the three epigrams, the following is the most interesting:

> This, the reward of their labour, has Athens bestowed on her leaders;
> token of duty well done, honour to valour supreme.

[190] *IG* I³ 503/504 = *CEG* 2 (tr. Fornara 1983: 51).
[191] Hdt. 7. 107; Th. 1. 98; Plu. *Cim*. 7.
[192] Aeschin. 3. 183 (tr. Adams). Cf. D. 20. 112–13.
[193] See, in particular, Aeschin. 3. 178–82. Stein-Hölkeskamp 1989: 216 considers the anecdote authentic.
[194] Gauthier 1985: 122–3; Shapiro 2012; Petrovic 2013: 205–6.

> Whoso in years yet to be shall read these lines in the marble,
> gladly will toil in his turn, giving his life for the state.[195]

The epigrams on the herms follow a principle similar to that behind the paintings of Marathon in the Stoa Poikile: some individuals were honored by highlighting them amid an acknowledgment of the merits of all the Athenian soldiers (who are praised collectively in the other two epigrams).[196] As in the case of the Stoa Poikile paintings, Cimon may have been behind the initiative to reward the heroes of Eion. According to Herodotus and Thucydides, he contributed the most to the success there, so the honors were above all rewards for him.[197]

Some sources mention that another important military leader of this period, Aristides, was awarded personal honors reminiscent of those bestowed on Harmodius and Aristogiton, in the sense that they benefited Aristides' descendants. The Athenian demos is said to have passed a decree granting Aristides' daughters the privilege of being married in the prytaneion, as well as dowries from the state.[198] Another decree – this one proposed by Alcibiades "the Elder" – provided Aristides' son Lysimachus with land and money: 100 *plethra* of orchard and as many of arable land on Euboea, 100 minas, and a pension of four drachmas per day.[199] Although some scholars consider these decrees historical,[200] they do not sit easily with the information about Lysimachus in Plato's *Laches*, which suggests that he came from a prosperous family and did not need a pension.[201] Apart from that, it is scarcely possible that Athens in the 460s BC – the time to which the proposal of Alcibiades "the Elder" most likely dates[202] – had land available on Euboea.[203] The hypothesis that the motion in favor of Lysimachus was put forward not by Alcibiades "the Elder" but by his grandson Alcibiades – the famous general of the Peloponnesian war[204] – would solve some of these contradictions, but there are problems with it as

[195] Aeschin. 3. 185 (tr. Adams). Cf. Plu. *Cim*. 7. [196] Aeschin. 3. 184–5.

[197] Hdt. 7. 107; Th. 1. 98. This does not mean that Plu. *Cim*. 7 is right that the honor of setting up the herms was awarded exclusively to Cimon (accepted by Welwei 1970: 304; Stein-Hölkeskamp 1989: 216); his assessment is a manipulation to emphasize the achievement of his hero (see Gauthier 1985: 123). On the place where the herms were erected, see Robertson 1999: 169–70; Shapiro 2012: 165.

[198] Aeschin. 3. 258; Nep. 3. 3; Plu. *Arist*. 27. 1. [199] D. 20. 115; Plu. *Arist*. 27. 2.

[200] Böckh 1886: vol. 1, 315; Erxleben 1975: 87–8; Lehmann 1996: 500; Brenne 2001: 117; A. Moreno 2007: 90 n. 64.

[201] Pl. *La*. 179c–d. See Davies 1971: 51; Rhodes 1981: 280; L. O'Sullivan 2009: 230–1. Erxleben 1975: 87–8 does not mention the pension but only the land.

[202] Brenne 2001: 96.

[203] Davies 1971: 51. Erxleben 1975: 88 agrees and therefore dates the decree to 453/2 or 446 BC (see also A. Moreno 2007: 90 n. 64).

[204] Raubitschek 1943: 32–3; Mattingly 1961: 131.

well.[205] The decrees are thus most likely fourth-century forgeries, conceived to highlight the generosity of the demos;[206] Habicht has identified several other fake decrees of this sort.[207]

Pericles, the most renowned late fifth-century Athenian political figure, is not absent from the list of men allegedly honored in their own time. Lycurgus reports that "Pericles, who took Samos, Euboea and Aegina, who built the Propylaea, the Odeum and the Hecatompedon, and who then deposited 1000 talents of silver in the acropolis, was crowned with a wreath of olive."[208] The information about the olive crown is also found in Valerius Maximus, who does not mention Pericles' specific merits but adds that he was the first general to be honored this way.[209] Both authors imply that the olive crown was awarded by the Athenian people and not by a small subset of citizens. If so, it is unlikely that Pericles was honored on account of the services Lycurgus mentions, for not until the final third of the fourth century did Athens begin to reward citizens for the benefactions accumulated throughout the course of a political career.[210] Before that, honors were awarded only for specific, concrete services such as a military victory or the exercise of a political function.[211] Lycurgus apparently mentions several achievements because he did not know the individual action for which Pericles was distinguished.[212] But is it believable in any case that Pericles was awarded an olive crown?[213] As noted, some generals before him received honors, even if modest ones. Moreover, by the early 420's BC and perhaps even

[205] It is possible that at the time of the younger Alcibiades, Lysimachus, who in Pl. *La*. and Ath. 11. 506b is characterized as an unsuccessful individual, had lost his father's fortune. The fact that by then Aristides' sisters "were well past marriageable age" (Davies 1971: 51) represents no problem, since the decree that dowers them is not the one proposed by Alcibiades and might have been issued earlier. There are, however, chronological problems: Erxleben 1975: 87.

[206] See Davies 1971: 51; Stein-Hölkeskamp 1999: 603. A. Moreno 2007: 45 does not dismiss the possibility that the decree of Alcibiades was forged and that the historical basis of the story of the granting of land to Lysimachus was the land owned by the Athenian elite in Euboea in the fifth century. See also Papazarkadas 2011: 226.

[207] Habicht 1961: 17–19.

[208] Lycurg. fr. 9 Conomis = 14 Burtt = 8 Durrbach; tr. Burtt.

[209] Val. Max. 2. 6. 5: "The same first introduced the custom of decorating good citizens with a crown, encircling the illustrious head of Pericles with two intertwined olive branches, a commendable institution whether one looks to the fact or the person. For the richest nourishment of virtue is honor, and Pericles deserved to be the one from whom the power of bestowing such a gift should make a start."

[210] See Gauthier 1985: 103–7.

[211] See Gauthier 1985: 113–15.

[212] That Lycurgus mentioned several benefactions as a result of the influence of the late-classical practice of honoring citizens for all the services rendered during a public career seems unlikely. The practice does not begin before 330 BC (Gauthier 1985: 103–5), and Lycurgus' text dates from 334 BC (Burtt 1954: 152).

[213] Gauthier 1985 accepts the information offered by Lycurgus and Valerius.

earlier, generals were rewarded with *sitêsis* in the prytaneion.[214] In the next chapter, I discuss how after Pericles' death generals were gradually honored more often, including with crowns, which soon became the typical reward for citizens. Pericles may thus have been the first Athenian honored by his fellow citizens in this way.

[214] *IG* I³ 131. As explained in Chapter 3, Section 3.3, the inscription is normally dated to sometime between 440 BC and the first half of the 420's BC. It might refer to *sitêsis* for generals as a new reward, or this might be an existing reward that was merely ratified by the decree. In the latter case, even if the inscription belonged to the post-Periclean period (Rivolta 2014), there may have been *sitêsis* for *stratêgoi* in the time of Pericles.

CHAPTER 5

The generalization of euergetism

In the final quarter of the fifth century and throughout the fourth century, official awards of honors to citizens in Athens increased significantly in number. This trend becomes apparent during the Peloponnesian War, increases after the Social War (357–355 BC), and is particularly visible in the time of Lycurgus (338–324 BC). The fields of public life in which benefactions were open to reward also widened: benefactors obtained more and more public recognition not only for athletic and military achievements but also for political services, diplomatic accomplishments, and financial contributions. The reasons for these changes can be traced to the Peloponnesian War and the loss of the empire afterward. But the process involved contradictions and tensions. The transformation of military and economic conditions was not accompanied by an immediate change of ideology (opposition to the formation of an honorand class within the citizen body continued) or by a change in the political system (the polis remained democratic) or the political status quo (the demos retained political power). As a consequence, the honors bestowed on citizens produced criticism, not only from a portion of the demos but also from members of the elite. The recognition of financial benefactions that indebted the mass of Athenians in a way reminiscent of patronage faced opposition from the demos, which responded by trying to funnel such assistance to the polis through obligatory contributions such as liturgies and *eisphorai*. In the end, however, honors for economic benefactions were accepted under certain conditions – the benefactions had to be performed under the control of the polis – and were integrated into the financial organization of the polis. Honors were also used to improve the administration and governance of the polis and to reinforce identification with the democratic regime. In this context, one means devised for resolving the tensions that resulted from awarding honors to members of the elite was to democratize them, generalizing the process so that other citizens benefited from it as well.

1 Euergetism and war

1.1 Benefactors during the Peloponnesian War

In 425 BC, the Athenian commanders Cleon and Demosthenes defeated the Spartans in the Battle of Sphacteria, one of the turning points in the first phase of the Peloponnesian War. Almost 300 hostages were brought to Athens, 120 of them Spartiates.[1] Although Demosthenes' military efforts had been as important as Cleon's, it was the latter who convinced the assembly to carry out the expedition[2] and was subsequently honored with *sitêsis, proedria*, and a crown. In *Knights*, performed in 424 BC shortly after these events, Aristophanes refers critically to the granting of the first two honors:

> And not a single general of the former generation would have applied to Cleaenetus for a state subsidy (*sitêsis*); whereas now if they don't get front-row seats (*proedria*) and free-meals (*sitia*, i.e. *sitêsis*)[3], they refuse to fight![4]

Aristophanes contrasts this attitude with that of the knights, who ask much less for their services:

> But we want only to fight nobly for the city and for its native gods. We ask nothing more, except for only this much: if peace ever comes and our toils are ended, don't begrudge us our long hair and our use of luxurious bathing utensils.[5]

To reward commanders with *sitêsis* was no novelty in 424 BC, as can be inferred from its mention in the prytaneion decree.[6] Since generals awarded *sitêsis* are mentioned there, and since we have no evidence of *sitêsis* without *proedria* in Athens, Cleon was most likely not the first general to receive both honors. What may have distressed Aristophanes was that Cleon asked for them (through his father Cleaenetus on Cleon's behalf, or on behalf of Cleaenetus himself). Perhaps no previous general dared to make such a request or to pressure the demos as Cleon may have done. More likely – since requesting rewards for services rendered should have been, in principle, acceptable[7] – in Aristophanes' opinion and that of

[1] Th. 4. 37–41. [2] Th. 4. 27–9. [3] Neil 1909: 87.
[4] Ar. *Eq*. 573–6 (tr. Henderson). The *sitêsis* granted Cleon is also mentioned at *Eq*. 280–3, and his *proedria* at *Eq*. 702.
[5] Ar. *Eq*. 576–80 (tr. Henderson).
[6] *IG* I^3 131. On the reference to *sitêsis* of generals as a reward, see Schöll 1872: 40; M. Osborne 1981: 164–5; Mattingly 1990: 114.
[7] See Chapter 1, Sections 3.1–2.

a number of other Athenians (although not the majority), Cleon's accomplishment did not deserve such expansive honors, and his behavior suggested that he was inappropriately more interested in personal advancement than in fulfilling his duties as a citizen.

In another passage of *Knights*, Aristophanes refers to Cleon's third honor, the crown. That he deals with this reward separately must mean that it was bestowed without a petition or that receiving a crown was not considered comparable to *sitêsis* and *proedria*, two of the "great honors" (*megistai timai*), along with a statue. In this passage, Aristophanes merely ridicules Cleon and says that he robbed the demos after it crowned him. In a symbolic way, Cleon is dispossessed of an honor he no longer deserves: Demos/the demos takes it away and places it on the head of the sausage seller instead.[8]

Aristophanes wanted to portray Cleon as negatively as possible, and he therefore tried to discredit his rewards. But this could work only if there was some basis in contemporary opinion to support the criticisms. These passages must accordingly reflect the existence of a wider debate already in fifth-century Athens about the honors awarded generals. I argued in Chapter 1 that it was difficult to maintain a balanced relationship in gift-exchange between giver and recipient because of the disjunction between gifts and counter-gifts and the difficulty of calculating equivalence. In the exchange between the Athenian community in the classical period and its civic benefactors, maintaining equilibrium was particularly difficult. The notion that citizens had duties to the community was highly developed and allowed *inter alia* for the call for liturgies.[9] But the introduction of official rewards such as crowns or *proedria* produced a conflict with nonofficial rewards such as political support, which had a long tradition that did not end when euergetic honors were introduced.

The complexity of the relationship between the polis and citizens who performed benefactions can also be observed in the rewards received by Alcibiades, Cleon's successor as Athens' leading general in the Peloponnesian War. Alcibiades' rewards, however, were less contentious. For one thing, his accomplishments were even greater than his predecessor's, and the recompense he received was less reminiscent of euergetic honors: he received only one recognizable euergetic distinction, a gold crown, a far more modest honor than the combination of *proedria* and

[8] Ar. *Eq*. 1225–54. This crown has also been interpreted as a "Kranz des Amtsträgers" or "Demagogenkranz" (Kraus 1985: 155; Lind 1990: 204). But see Blech 1982: 154–5; Henderson 1998: 220–1.

[9] See Chapter 4, Section 1.2.

sitêsis. In addition, as Xenophon, a witness to the events, remarks, the polis at the time was completely controlled by Alcibiades' partisans, which may not have made his reward less contentious but does mean that the lack of evidence for contemporary criticism comes as no surprise.[10]

After Alcibiades was exiled for alleged participation in the mutilation of the herms and the profanation of the Eleusinian Mysteries,[11] he commanded the Athenian fleet at Samos in 411 BC and contributed decisively to a series of important victories in the Hellespont and the Black Sea at a time when the city desperately needed a success. In 408 BC,[12] he returned to Athens and was received by a huge number of citizens at the Piraeus.[13] The assembly then resolved to crown him with a gold crown[14] and appoint him military commander in chief.[15] In addition, it ordered the stelae on which his conviction was recorded thrown into the sea,[16] asked the priests to revoke their curses on him,[17] and returned the land that had been confiscated from him.[18]

Among the ancient writers who describe Alcibiades' return to Athens, only Plutarch mentions the gold crown,[19] and most modern scholars who deal with the event make no reference to it.[20] But the crowning of Alcibiades with gold is not Plutarch's invention, since Nepos apparently already knew it.[21] Nor does the detail seem to have been invented by a common source, for a speech by Lysias delivered in 395 BC, relatively close to the date of Alcibiades' return, refers to the *dôreai* granted him by the assembly.[22] As noted in Chapter 1, the word is typically used in the sources to refer to honors granted benefactors by the assembly, particularly crowns; indeed, Lysias himself uses the word that way.[23] The plural must refer to something

[10] X. *HG* 1. 4. 11–12, 19–20. See also Bloedow 1973: 69. [11] Furley 1996: 3, 41–4.
[12] For the date (408 BC rather than 407 BC), see Bleckmann 1998: 293–5; Heftner 2011: 161–2, 262 n. 61. Cf. Verdegem 2010: 35 n. 67; Rhodes 2011: 73, 80, 83.
[13] X. *HG* 1. 4. 13; D.S. 13. 69; Nep. 7. 6; Just. *Epit.* 5. 4. 9–11; Plu. *Alc.* 32. [14] Plu. *Alc.* 33.2.
[15] X. *HG* 1. 4. 20; D.S. 13. 69; Plu. *Alc.* 33. 2. [16] D.S. 13. 69; Nep. 7. 6.
[17] D.S. 13. 69; Nep. 7. 6; Just. *Epit.* 5. 4. 14; Plu. *Alc.* 33. 3.
[18] D.S. 13. 69; Nep. 7. 6; Plu. *Alc.* 33. 3.
[19] Plutarch actually speaks of several crowns, but this must be an exaggeration. Although the Athenians honored Alexander the Great with two crowns (*IG* II^2 1496. 55–7), they normally granted only one (in the fifth and especially the fourth century, when granting crowns became common practice).
[20] Beloch 1884: 81–2; Toepffer 1894: 1516–33; Taeger 1943: 214–15; Hatzfeld 1951: 297; McGregor 1965: 41; Lévy 1976: 140–1; Rhodes 1985b: 16; Ostwald 1986: 429; Ellis 1989: 89; Andrewes 1992: 488–9; Meier 1993: 658. Not even the most recent biographies refer to the crown: Heftner 2011; Rhodes 2011. Exceptions are Bengtson 1983: 176; Kagan 2003: 435.
[21] Nep. 7. 6, says that Alcibiades was welcomed with gold crowns at the Piraeus. But Nepos has merged two events: the crowns with which Alcibiades was showered when he disembarked (Plu. *Alc.* 32. 4) and the gold crown granted by the assembly (Plu. *Alc.* 33. 2); Domingo Gygax 2006b: 485–7.
[22] Lys. 14. 31. Cf. Isoc. 16. 11. [23] Lys. 21. 11; fr. 70. 171–9 Carey.

in addition to the land Alcibiades recovered, and in the list of rewards in the sources, only the crown can be described as a *dôrea*.[24]

There is no evidence of an Athenian citizen being honored with a gold crown by the city before Alcibiades.[25] But granting unlimited power to a single general was also "an unprecedented measure in the Athenian history," as Bloedow observed;[26] the situation was a special one.[27] Nor can Xenophon's omission of the gold crown be used as a counterargument, for he offers a highly condensed version of Alcibiades' arrival and omits mention of the other benefits, whose historicity almost no one questions.[28] Several other bits of data also support the historicity of Alcibiades' crown. Pericles may have received an olive crown,[29] Cleon one of an unknown material,[30] and at least two references in the ancient sources suggest that the Athenians rewarded citizens with crowns of unspecified material prior to Alcibiades' return.[31] In 410/9 BC, moreover, just before Alcibiades came back to Athens, Thrasybulus of Calydon, a resident alien (*metoikos*) who had killed the oligarch Phrynichus, was awarded a gold crown.[32] Shortly after Alcibiades' supposed crowning, Epicerdes of Cyrene was crowned twice, probably with gold.[33] Outside Athens, Scione honored the Spartan general Brasidas with a gold crown in 423 BC in a context that recalls Alcibiades' crowning: the Scionians welcomed Brasidas, who was then crowned by the polis as a liberator of Hellas.[34]

Alcibiades, having obtained great military success at a time when commanders increasingly capitalized on victories,[35] must have presented himself as a benefactor in his speech to the assembly. We have already seen how Thucydides' Alcibiades tried to convince the assembly of his right to

[24] This is why some commentators on Lysias and Isocrates have assumed that by *dôreai*, Lysias refers to the crowns: Gernet and Bizos 1955: 231; De Romilly 1995: 200; Ley-Hutton and Brodersen 1993–197: vol. 2, 292. See also Domingo Gygax 2006b: 487–8.

[25] It is possible, however, that the gold crown with which the demos crowned Peisetaerus in Aristophanes' *Birds* (performed in 414 BC) reflects a real practice of honoring citizens. See Dunbar 1995: 635; Zanetto and Del Corno 1987: 281; Domingo Gygax 2006b: 493–4.

[26] Bloedow 1973: 70. See also Hatzfeld 1951: 297–8; Bengtson 1979: 24; Rhodes 1985b: 16.

[27] Domingo Gygax 2006b: 490.

[28] Cf. Hatzfeld 1951: 297; Rhodes 1985b: 16; Ellis 1989: 89; Andrewes 1992: 488; Meier 1993: 658; De Romilly 1995: 200. Bleckmann 1998: 472–6, is more skeptical. But Lys. 14. 31 certainly confirms at least the information in D.S. 13. 69, Nep. 7. 6 and Plu. *Alc.* 33, about the assembly's decision to compensate Alcibiades for the confiscated property.

[29] Lycurg. fr. 9 Conomis = 14 Burtt = 8 Durrbach; Val. Max. 2. 6. 5. [30] Ar. *Eq.* 1225–54.

[31] And. 1. 45; 2. 18. The first passage refers to the year 415 BC. The second speech is from between 410 BC and 405 BC, but probably 409 BC or 408 BC (Harris 2013: 413–14).

[32] *IG* I³ 102. On this award, see Wilson 2009: 10–16.

[33] *IG* I³ 125. As Henry 1983: 30–1 indicates, a proclamation of an olive crown is unlikely. One of the crowns was awarded in 405/4 BC, the other earlier.

[34] Th. 4. 121. 1. [35] E. *Andr.* 693–702 also reflects the trend. See Stevens 1971: 178.

command the Sicilian expedition (415 BC) by depicting himself as a benefactor of the polis.[36] Regardless of whether or not Thucydides' report of the speech is accurate, Alcibiades must have applied this strategy during his political career and most likely in 408 BC. Everything thus indicates that he was honored with a public reward. But the official reward, the gold crown, was not the only one. The assembly's other measures relating to Alcibiades were not taken only to reverse unfair earlier decisions, and his appointment as commander in chief was not made only because "he was the man to recover for the state its former power."[37] All these decisions had a component of reward as well. Political and military power as a counter-gift was not a novelty, as we know from the politics of largesse. This was also what Alcibiades supposedly requested in 415 BC; seven years later, the counter-gift was more reasonable, since his benefactions were great military accomplishments.

Cleon and Alcibiades were not the only commanders honored with crowns during the Peloponnesian War, for the practice became common. In *On his Return*, dated between 410 BC and 405 BC,[38] Andocides reminds the assembly: "You bestow crowns on such persons (*stratêgoi*) and publicly proclaim them as heroes." Unlike Aristophanes in *Knights* with regard to Cleon's *sitêsis* and *proedria*, Andocides offers no criticism of the rewards: "I will not deny that they deserve it; it is proof of signal merit to be able to render one's country a service in any way whatsoever." (This assessment was part of Andocides' strategy to prove that he had achieved great things, but perhaps also a sign of the normality of the act.[39]) Xenophon's version of Euryptolemus' speech at the so-called Arginusae trial in 406 BC also suggests that granting crowns to generals became a widespread practice during the Peloponnesian War years; Euryptolemus says that it would be more just to honor the prosecuted generals with crowns than to condemn them.[40]

1.2 *Beyond military benefactions*

The Peloponnesian War allowed some Athenians to perform services for the polis that were not of a strictly military nature, for example, facilitating

[36] Th. 6. 16. [37] X. *HG* 1. 4. 20.

[38] Cf. Maidment 1941: 454–8; Missiou 1992: 26 n. 35; Gagarin and MacDowell 1998: 141; Harris 2013: 413–14.

[39] And. 2. 17–18 (tr. Maidment); Furley 1996. On my reading of this passage, only generals are given crowns; the officers mentioned at the beginning are not an object of this honor. For a different interpretation, see Engen 2010: 144–5.

[40] X. *HG* 1. 33. See Burckhardt 2000: 131.

the grain supply and importing goods needed for the war (e.g., oar spars and bronze). Such actions were, on the one hand, economic contributions, the type of assistance the demos had for many years been unwilling to receive from citizens outside liturgies, and even more unwilling to reward publicly. But they were also related to military operations, in connection with which citizens other than athletes had first been rewarded with public honors. This made it easier to eventually institute rewards for aid that represented something between pure "economic benefaction" – as we may call it – and military accomplishments.

By performing such a benefaction, Andocides – who like Alcibiades was sent into exile when he was implicated in the affair of the herms – tried to recover the civic rights of which he had been deprived. Unable to perform great deeds as a general, as Alcibiades had, he had to look for an alternative. He explains in *On his Return*: "I decided that I should be best advised either to have done with life or to render this city such a service as would dispose you to let me at last resume my rights as your fellow."[41] In 411 BC, he accordingly rendered an extraordinary service to the Athenian fleet in Samos, being "reckless of both life and goods":

> I at once proceeded to supply your forces in Samos with oar-spars – this was after the 400 had seized power at Athens – since Archelaus had hereditary connections with my family and offered me the right of cutting and exporting as many as I wished. And not only did I supply the spars; I refused to charge more for them than they had cost me, although I might have obtained a price of five drachmae apiece. In addition, I supplied grain and bronze. Thus equipped, the forces in Samos went on to defeat the Peloponnesians at sea; and it was they, and they alone, who saved Athens at the time. Now if those heroes rendered you true service by their deeds, I may fairly claim that that service was in no small degree due to me.[42]

Interestingly, Andocides argues that this type of economic benefaction is superior to the victories recorded by generals:

> You must understand, gentlemen, how far such services as mine surpass ordinary services. When citizens who hold public office add to your revenues, are they not in fact giving you what is yours already? When those who hold military command benefit their country by some fine exploit, is it not by exposing your persons to fatigue and danger, and *by spending public money* in addition, that they render you such service as they do? Again, if they make a mistake at some point, it is not they themselves who pay for their mistake; it is you who pay for the error which was due

[41] And. 2. 10 (tr. Maidment).

[42] And. 2. 11–12 (tr. Maidment, slightly adapted). On Andocides' trading activity, see A. Moreno 2007: 245–51.

to them. . . . You must see that that man is far the worthiest who has the courage to expose his own life and his own goods to danger in order to confer a benefit on his fellow-countrymen.[43]

But rendering this service to his homeland did not help Andocides; instead, he was imprisoned by the 400, who regarded his aid to the democratic fleet at Samos as an act of hostility toward the new regime. His speech was given later, between 410 BC and 405 BC, when he was about to fulfill a new benefaction of the same sort: supplying Athens with grain at a time when shipments from the Black Sea had been partially or totally disrupted. He did not succeed in recuperating his civic rights in this second attempt either. But the fact that he used the same strategy and that he addressed the assembly in such terms says a great deal about the evolution of the Athenians' relationship to their benefactors during the Peloponnesian War years. Such benefactions led not only to counter-gifts such as the one Andocides was expecting but also to official honors such as crowns.[44]

Isocrates provides evidence for crowns being granted during the Peloponnesian War for benefactions similar to those Andocides performed. One of Isocrates' clients recalls how after the defeat at Aegospotami in 405 BC, he, unlike the other trierarchs, did not resign his duties but persuaded his brother to join him; the two of them paid the crew out of their own means (rather than asking the polis to do so, as normally happened).[45] Moreover, after the Spartan commander Lysander in 405 BC threatened anyone who imported grain into Athens with death, he and his brother seized some that was intended for the Spartans and brought it to the Piraeus: "In recognition for these services, you voted that we should be honored with crowns, and that in front of the statues of the eponymous heroes we should be proclaimed as the authors of great blessings."[46] The main differences between this case and Andocides' – other than the outcome – are that Isocrates' benefactors were not acting in a private capacity but as trierarchs, and that the military component of

[43] And. 2. 17–18 (tr. Maidment, slightly adapted).

[44] That Andocides did not achieve his goal in his second attempt might be related to the fact that he performed his benefactions as a private citizen rather than an officer (Engen 2010: 144–5). But while it is true that the Athenians were reluctant to honor citizens for benefactions performed outside public office – this question is discussed later on – Andocides is not asking for honors but to recover his civic rights. As a matter of fact, although the Athenians were also against honoring liturgists for their liturgies, former liturgists, by virtue of their liturgies, were able to obtain compensations of the kind Andocides was asking for.

[45] Ley-Hutton and Brodersen 1993–1997: vol. 2, 299.

[46] Isoc. 18. 61 (tr. Norlin).

their benefactions was more significant. The economic dimension of those benefactions is nonetheless manifest.

But as the Athenians gradually began to reward more citizens with official honors for benefactions beyond military accomplishments, they did not limit themselves to those who offered services of an economic nature. In 415 BC, for example, they awarded honors to at least one citizen whose benefaction was purely political: Diocleides. Diocleides' benefaction was also related to the scandal of the desecration of the herms and the profanation of the Mysteries, although he was rewarded for denouncing the perpetrators. He claimed to have seen about 300 men, 42 of whom he could name. The number of individuals involved immediately aroused suspicions that an oligarchic plot was underway, and Diocleides was accordingly honored for (in the people's opinion) having saved the democracy from an internal threat. The fact that he thus resembled Harmodius and Aristogiton explains why he was honored with a crown and a meal (*deipnon*) in the prytaneion.[47]

Although the Athenians were far more ready to reward their fellow-citizens for services to democracy reminiscent of the Tyrannicides than for economic gifts or even military victories – controversy surrounding the latter has already been noted – the stability of the democracy meant that the former action was rare. In 410/9 BC, Thrasybulus of Calydon was awarded a gold crown for having killed Phrynichus, the leader of the 400, but he was a metic rather than a citizen.[48] Thrasybulus son of Lycus and the other "heroes of Phyle" rewarded shortly after 403/2 BC (not in that year, as traditionally believed) by the Archinus decree for having fought against the Thirty Tyrants, on the other hand, were mostly if not all citizens.[49] From the preserved fragments of the decree, we know that the individuals listed were all Athenians, or that at most 3 out of 54 or so were non-Athenians. If there was a second list, as has been inferred from Aeschines,[50] even if this list contained only names of noncitizens – it could have listed citizens as well as foreigners, or only citizens, the difference between the two lists being chronological rather than a matter of origin – citizens must have outnumbered noncitizens.[51] The Archinus decree thus honored

[47] And. 1. 45. Cf. Th. 6. 60; D.S. 12. 2. Diocleides' story turned out to be a lie.
[48] *IG* I^3 102.
[49] *SEG* XXVIII 45. On the date, see *SEG* LII 86: a new fragment shows that the archon cannot have been Eucleides.
[50] According to Aeschin. 3. 187, the number of honorands was a little more than 100.
[51] The majority of scholars consider them all Athenians (e.g., Munn 2000: 257; Wolpert 2002: 44). The two most detailed studies of the question have reached divergent conclusions: according to Krentz 1982, there were no foreigners or metics, but Taylor 2002 disagrees. See also Sears 2013: 267; Steinbock 2013: 241 n. 93. J. Shear believes that the rewards granted the non-Athenians who

predominantly (or exclusively) citizens, who were rewarded with a crown (in this case of olive leaves), with a sum of money for sacrifice and dedicatory offerings,[52] and with the inscription of their names in an honorific decree that read as follows:

> These [men for their courage have been honored with crowns by the indigenous] people [of Athens. For once, when men with unjust] ordinances [were ruling the city, they were the first for their deposition] to take initiative, [even though it meant risking their lives].[53]

The citizens "who died by violent death in the oligarchy helping the democracy" of the Theozotides decree were also rewarded. The benefits bestowed on their children were not only a charitable measure but also, as stated in the decree, a reward "for the sake of the benefaction (*euergesia*) of their fathers toward the Athenian people." Despite not being a typical honorific decree, the decree was, as Lambert points out, "implicitly honorific in intention."[54] Unfortunately, the historical context of this distinction is unclear. Most scholars have followed Stroud in believing that the beneficiaries were Athenians who died fighting the Thirty and that the decree is from 403/2 BC, but it has also been argued that the oligarchy in question is that of the 400 and that the decree thus belongs to 410 BC or a little later.[55]

According to the *Athenaion Politeia*, the dissolution of the regime of the Thirty brought honors even to some oligarchs. Rhinon of Paeania and the other members of the Board of Ten who negotiated with the democrats in the Piraeus and worked for the return of the exiles received a vote of thanks from the assembly: they "were commended for their goodwill (*eunoia*)

supported the democracy against the Thirty in *IG* II² 10 make Taylor's interpretation untenable (J. Shear 2007: 99 n. 30, and J. Shear 2011: 233 n. 28). This decree, however, offers rewards of a different kind (citizenship and *isoteleia*, only citizenship, or only *ateleia*); these could be additional rewards. It would reinforce this argument if *IG* II² 10 were not contemporary with the Archinus decree, but it now seems that not only *IG* II² 10 but also the Archinus decree belong after 403/2 BC (cf. *SEG* LII 86 for the Archinus decree; *IG* II² 10 is probably from 401/0 BC: Rhodes and Osborne 2003: 26).

[52] On the material of the crowns and the pecuniary reward, Aeschin. 3. 187; Nep. 8. 4. 1.

[53] *SEG* XXVIII 45 (tr. Harding 1985: no. 7). The reconstruction is based on Aeschin. 3. 190, which preserves the epigram.

[54] *SEG* XXVIII 46 (tr. Harding 1985: no. 8); Lambert 2012a: 5 n. 6. Eucles (cf. And. 1. 112, 115) was also honored for his services to the Athenian democracy in 403 BC (*Agora* XVI 52), but the decree – probably not inscribed until 359/8 BC or the 360s at private initiative, together with a decree in honor of his son Philocles – was passed at a time (between 402/1 BC and 400/399 BC) when he was not yet an Athenian citizen (see M. Osborne 1981–1983, vol. 3, 40).

[55] For 403/2 BC, see Stroud 1971: 285–7; *contra* Calabi Limentani 1985 and Matthaiou 2011: 76–81, who thinks that the beneficiaries were Athenians executed by the 400, as well as those killed by the oligarchic clans before the institution of the oligarchy. See also Blok 2015.

toward the people." They were clearly benefactors: "while they were in power, there took place the reconciliation and the return of the people, with their active and eager support." Particularly relevant were the contributions of Rhinon of Paeania and Phayllus of Acherdus, "for these men had repeatedly gone on missions to the men at Piraeus before Pausanias' arrival, and after his arrival they zealously supported the return." [56]

Finally, we must consider some honors for potential benefactors – the rewards promised in the Demophantus decree to individuals killed defending the democracy: "If anyone shall lose his life in slaying such a one (an enemy of the democracy) or in attempting to slay him, I will show him and his children the kindness shown to Harmodius and Aristogiton and their children." [57] Although the authenticity of the version of the decree attributed to Andocides has been questioned, [58] the decree itself must have existed, since Demosthenes and Lycurgus cited it. [59] Moreover, the honors foreseen for the defenders of democracy are not an invention, for they are mentioned by Demosthenes in his summary: "the inscription of Demophantus, already referred to by Phormio, on which it stands written and confirmed by oath that whoever suffers in defense of the democracy shall receive the same rewards (*dôreai*) as Harmodius and Aristogiton." [60] The date of the decree is more problematic. The traditional date, 410 BC, [61] is based on an emendation of the name of the secretary of the first prytany in the text transmitted to us; [62] Andocides does not speak of a Demophantus decree but of a Solon law, and he refers to it as a law that no longer applies, whereas Demosthenes and Lycurgus consider the Demophantus decree still valid, and Lycurgus dates it to "after the rule of the Thirty." Although all these problems can be answered, [63] one wonders why, if the Athenians in 410 BC were inclined to reward the defenders of

[56] [Arist.] *Ath.* 38. 3–4 (tr. Rackham, modified). For a reconstruction of the sequence of events and a discussion of the inaccuracies in Ps.-Aristotle's account, see Carawan 2013: 67, 144–8, 158–9, 165–6.

[57] And. 1. 98 (tr. Maidment, slightly adapted).

[58] Andoc. 1. 96–8. Cf. Canevaro and Harris 2012: 119–25, with the conclusion "not a genuine text of the decree of Demophantus"; see also Sommerstein and Bayliss 2013, 74–5 n. 51, and Sommerstein 2014: not the document Andocides asks the clerk to read from the stele but one probably inserted in the Hellenistic age, reproducing the text referred to by Demosthenes and Lycurgus (see next footnote) and taken by the interpolator from a collection of decrees.

[59] D. 20. 159; Lycurg. 1. 125–7. Cf. Canevaro and Harris 2012: 121.

[60] D. 20. 159 (tr. Vince, modified).

[61] This date is accepted in the most recent discussions of the decree: J. Shear 2011: 72–3; McGlew 2012; Sommerstein and Bayliss 2013: 48 n. 1, 74–5; Teegarden 2013; Sommerstein 2014.

[62] From "Cleogenes" to "Cleigenes," mentioned in *IG* I^3 375. Cf. Matthaiou 2011: 81 n. 18: "I find the generally accepted dating [of the Demophantus decree] to 410 not as safe as it has been assumed."

[63] It is not uncommon for Athenian orators to call any Athenian law a "law of Solon" (Ehrenberg 2011: 71); the claim that the law was not in force could simply be Andocides' personal interpretation of the

democracy against tyranny with the same high honors as Harmodius and Aristogiton received, in 403/2 BC they rewarded the heroes of Phyle and – depending on how we date the Theozotides decree – the citizens who died in the fight against the Thirty so modestly. Was this due to the policy of reconciliation?[64] We know that the rewards for Thrasybulus' army were controversial; Archinus, who proposed his own bill, blocked Thrasybulus' initial proposal. The controversy, however, was not about the magnitude of honors for the citizens, but about whether foreigners who supported Thrasybulus should be honored with citizenship.[65] A date of 410 BC for the Demophantus decree would thus seem to fit better in the history of Athenian democracy than in the history of Athenian euergetism.[66]

The Demophantus decree, in any case, with its oath binding every Athenian to kill anyone who becomes or attempts to become a tyrant, reminds us that we should not look at the honors for the heroes of Phyle and the victims of oligarchy in the Theozotides decree as simple rewards. These honors also served to encourage a certain behavior among Athenians: to act immediately against anyone who attempted to subvert the democracy.[67] Consonant with this intention, the decree for the heroes of Phyle stresses that "*they took the initiative*, although it meant risking their lives." For the same reason, the stelae were not displayed on the acropolis (or in another sanctuary) – as had been done with almost all inscriptions up to that point[68] – but in the agora, the place where they would be most visible and would be associated with statues embodying the type of behavior they tried to promote, those of Harmodius and Aristogiton. But the agora was also chosen for symbolic purposes. As Julia Shear has shown, after 410 BC the area became the center for the display of the power of the demos and a symbol of the Athenian democracy.[69] It is symptomatic that the inscribed decree honoring non-Athenian supporters of the

amnesty of 403 BC (Bleckmann 1998: 437 n. 185); Lycurgus makes other chronological errors in connection with events and laws (Engels 2008: 168).

[64] Strauss 1986: 97: "By de-emphasizing the achievement of the men of Phyle, Archinus also de-emphasized the villainy of their opponents, thus reducing tension between democrats and the former Three Thousand."

[65] [Arist.] *Ath.* 40. 2.

[66] Canevaro and Harris 2012: 124–5 date the Demophantus decree to after Andocides' trial in 400/399 BC (*contra* Sommerstein 2014). Another "solution" would be to hypothesize the erection of a new stele with additions to the text in 403 BC (Bleckmann 1998: 437 n. 185); the problem that Andocides considers the law invalid, however, would remain.

[67] On Athenian mechanisms to prompt and coordinate responses to oligarchic attempts, see Teegarden 2013.

[68] Liddel 2003; J. Shear 2007: 97–101; Meyer 2013.

[69] J. Shear 2007; J. Shear 2011: 89–122.

democracy against the Thirty (probably dating to 401/400 BC) was placed on the acropolis, not in the agora.[70]

As a result of Athens' difficulties, however, during the second half of the Peloponnesian War, most of the benefactions honored between 415 BC and the end of the fifth century were probably of a military or (less often) economic sort. Already by 400 BC, many citizens had been rewarded for such reasons. Thus two brothers who brought grain to Piraeus in 405 BC could say around 400 BC: "you crowned us for our brave acts at a time when it was not as easy as it is now to win that honor."[71]

2 Benefactors without empire

2.1 *The great* euergetai *of fourth-century Athens*

In the three decades following their defeat in the Peloponnesian War, the Athenians rewarded several commanders in a spectacular fashion, granting them *inter alia* the "greatest honors" (*megistai timai*): a statue, *sitêsis*, and *proedria*.[72] Only in this sense can we speak of "great benefactors," since the benefactions themselves were not superior to the deeds of many fifth-century military commanders. To be more precise, these men were great *euergetai* rather than genuinely great benefactors.

In 393 BC, the assembly decided to reward the Athenian Conon with a bronze statue in the agora,[73] a gold crown,[74] and exemption (*ateleia*) from taxes and liturgies.[75] Whether Conon also received *sitêsis* and *proedria* is unclear.[76] In any event, the grant of this statue brought a monopoly previously enjoyed by Harmodius and Aristogiton to an end; for the first time, a man was honored this way while still alive. The statue was erected in front of the Stoa of Zeus, apparently with the decree inscribed next to it, to make the honorific character of the monument clear.[77] Why this great distinction for Conon? In August 394 BC, during a war with Sparta over control of the Greek poleis in Asia Minor, a Persian fleet he commanded destroyed the Spartan navy at Cnidus.[78] Demosthenes reports that "in breaking up the empire of the Spartans, [Conon] had ended no

[70] *IG* II² 10 = RO 4. [71] Isoc. 18. 65 (tr. Norlin, altered).
[72] See in general Gauthier 1985: 96–8. [73] D. 20. 70; Isoc. 9. 57; Paus. 1. 3. 2; Nep. 13. 2. 3.
[74] D. 22. 72; 24. 180. [75] D. 20. 70. See Gauthier 1985: 97.
[76] Isoc. 9. 57 claims that Conon and Evagoras king of Salamis were awarded *megistai timai*, but the scholiast on D. 21. 62 says explicitly that Conon received only a statue and neither *sitêsis* nor *proedria*.
[77] On the location and inscription, J. Shear 2007: 99, 107, 111; J. Shear 2011: 276–7.
[78] X. *HG* 4. 3. 11 ff.; D.S 14. 83. 5–7.

insignificant tyranny," and the Athenians accordingly honored him like Harmodius and Aristogiton.[79] The idea of Conon as tyrannicide is attractive,[80] but one wonders if the assembly that honored him in 393 BC really perceived him as such; the interpretation seems to be presented *a posteriori*, to explain why Conon was the first living individual awarded a statue. In fact, there can be no doubt that the main motive for rewarding Conon was his victory at Cnidus. Demosthenes quotes part of the preamble of the decree in his honor: "Whereas Conon . . . freed the allies of Athens."[81] Evagoras, the Cypriot king of Salamis awarded a bronze statue in the Athenian agora at around the same time, received this recognition because of his contribution to the victory at Cnidus. So, too, the other poleis that honored Conon at that time apparently did so because he had liberated them from Spartan domination.[82] But when the Athenians decided to honor him, they may also have had in mind other actions that made them feel indebted: Conon had dedicated a temple to Aphrodite Euploia at Piraeus;[83] had offered an impressive sacrifice (*hekatombê*) and invited all Athenians to the feast;[84] and, above all else, had rebuilt the Long Walls with money from the Persian satrap Pharnabazus.[85] To judge from what Demosthenes says, Conon was honored for several services, the reconstruction of the Long Walls being particularly important: "Many of his achievements, men of Athens, deserve praise, and all of them make it improper to revoke the gifts (*dôreai*) they earned for him, but the noblest deed of all was his restoration of the Long Walls."[86]

That said, the honors for Conon may have had parallels with those for Harmodius and Aristogiton, even if Conon was not seen as a tyrannicide. While the statues of Harmodius and Aristogiton symbolized the foundation of the democracy, the honors awarded Conon were a way to signal the revival of the polis. Conon had destroyed Spartan sea power, had brought a new contingent to rebuild the Athenian fleet, and had restored the Long Walls. In 393 BC, the Athenians could look to the future again, and they needed a gesture of reaffirmation to face it, in the same way that honoring Harmodius and Aristogiton served to lay the foundations of the

[79] D. 20. 70 (tr. Vince, altered). Cf. Dinarch. 1. 14: "Conon who liberated Greece."
[80] See, for example, J. Shear 2007: 108; J. Shear 2011: 278. [81] D. 20. 69 (tr. Vince).
[82] *Syll.*[3] 126 = Tod 106 = *I. Erythrai* 6; D. 20. 71; Paus. 6. 3. 16. [83] Paus. 1. 1. 3. [84] Ath. 1. 3d.
[85] Conon was not, however, the one who took the initiative; the reconstruction had begun already in 395/4 BC (X. *HG* 4. 8. 1–9; D.S. 14. 82. 2 ff., 84. 4 ff.; *IG* II[2] 1656–64; Tod 107 A; *SEG* XLI 102). See Conwell 2008.
[86] D. 20. 72 (tr. Vince).

democracy. The comparison can be extended further: if honoring the Tyrannicides disguised the fact that the Spartans, rather than the Athenians themselves, ended the tyranny, honoring Conon allowed Athens to appropriate a Spartan defeat achieved with a Persian fleet. The statue of Evagoras also contributed to this rewriting of the past, insofar as it kept Persian intervention in the background (a point discussed further later in this section).[87] By contrast, the satrap Pharnabazus, without whom the Spartans would not have been defeated nor the Long Walls financed, got no recognition.[88] But the official version of history that depicted Harmodius and Aristogiton as liberators from tyranny had to coexist with one that attributed the action to the Spartans, while the image of Conon as destroyer of Spartan naval power had to compete with one that highlighted the Persians' role. Isocrates in his *Panegyricus* (*ca*. 380 BC) accordingly complains about those who extolled the Persians and tries to prove that without Conon, they would have accomplished nothing.[89] In addition, the increase in the number of individuals honored in the final years of the Peloponnesian War had devalued honors,[90] so that a new type had to be awarded if Conon's distinction was to be marked as special. Several poleis that honored him (Samos, Ephesus, Erythrae) did so with statues.[91] If that occurred before Athens voted him honors,[92] the city may well have felt obliged to act at the same level.[93]

The statue for Evagoras was not the first honor awarded the Cypriot king by the Athenians. Previously – around 407 BC – he was granted citizenship.[94] But Evagoras did not receive the statue as a citizen: "A person who had been given the citizenship, but who had not taken

[87] The decree in honor of Evagoras (*IG* II² 20 = RO 11).

[88] The poleis of Asia Minor, however, sent him presents (X. *HG* 4. 8. 2). The reference to Pharnabazus in *IG* II³ 361 = RO 9 (from 327/6 BC) does not suffice to contradict this picture; cf. Lambert 2012b: 262–3.

[89] Isoc. 4. 142.

[90] As noted, Isoc. 18. 65 shows that obtaining a crown was not considered as special around 400 BC as it had been in 405 BC.

[91] Paus. 6. 3. 16 (Samos and Ephesus); *Syll.*³ 126 = Tod 106 = *I. Erythrai* 6 (Erythrae).

[92] Cf. X. *HG* 4. 8: "Pharnabazus and Conon, after defeating the Lacedaemonians in the naval battle [*sc.* at Cnidus], made a tour of the islands and the cities on the sea coast, drove out the Laconian governors, and encouraged the cities by saying that they would not establish fortified citadels within their walls and would leave them independent."

[93] As Gauthier 1985: 97, points out, Conon, having spent considerable time outside of Athens, was probably regarded almost as a foreigner (and the Athenians were less reluctant to honor foreigners). But this does not explain why a statue was chosen, since this was not an honor awarded to foreigners. (Evagoras was the first foreigner to receive a statue.) Statues were a monopoly of the Tyrannicides, and in this sense it did not matter much if the benefactor was a foreigner or a citizen.

[94] Isoc. 9. 54; [D.] 12. 10. The assumption is that the decree in honor of Evagoras (*IG* I³ 113) included this grant of citizenship.

steps to implement it, was not regarded as of citizen status by virtue of the decree in his favor alone"; Evagoras was such a case,[95] even if Pausanias says that he performed his benefaction "*as an Athenian* whose ancestry connected him with Salamis."[96] Moreover, it is unlikely that Evagoras' statue even honored him as a "virtual" Athenian on the ground of his honorific citizenship. As has been noted, Isocrates, when referring to Conon's and Evagoras' achievements in relation to Cnidus, stresses that Evagoras had been awarded Athenian citizenship.[97] But he does this mainly to make it clear that Evagoras cared a great deal about Athens (enough to have performed benefactions in the past that entitled him to the highest honor for a foreigner: citizenship). The fragmentary decree that presumably rewarded him with a statue and was apparently erected next to it called him *basileus*, a title not normally used by the Athenians to refer to Evagoras and that would have been out of place in the context of an attempt to highlight his Athenian pedigree. (In the decree that probably awarded him citizenship, in contrast, he was simply called "Salaminios."[98]) On the other hand, the "statue-decree" highlights the fact that Evagoras, despite working for the Persians, performed his benefaction as a "Greek on behalf of Greece."[99] This seems to have been the point that most concerned the Athenians: Evagoras' status as a Greek and a benefactor of Greece. According to Isocrates, he had given refuge to many Greeks separately from Conon, and together with Conon he advised the Persians in such a way that "not only the mainland alone would profit" but "all Hellas would have a share in the victory." The depiction of Evagoras as a benefactor of Hellas works better if he is described as Greek instead of Athenian.[100] By associating Conon with Evagoras, the Athenians, in addition to pushing the central role of the Persians into the background, reinforced Conon's (and Athens') image as benefactor of the Greeks. At the time the inscriptions of the Archinus decree, the Theozotides decree, and the decree for the non-Athenians supporters of democracy were erected, only honors for Athenian benefactors seem to have been put on display in the agora. When Evagoras received his statue, however, this was clearly no longer the case. Athens had a long history of

[95] For the quotation as well as Evagoras, see M. Osborne 1983: v. IV, 153; see also Deene 2011: 163.
[96] M. Osborne 1983: v. IV, 153 (first quotation); see also Deene 2011: 163; Paus. 1. 3. 2 (second quotation, tr. Jones).
[97] Isoc. 9. 54.
[98] *IG* II^2 20 (statue); *IG* I^3 113 (citizenship). See Lewis and Stroud 1979: 188. It is interesting to note that the relief accompanying the decree depicted a female figure that may have been a personification of Salamis watching Evagoras receive his honors (Smith 2011: 104).
[99] Line 15. See Lewis and Stroud 1979: 190; Sealey 1993: 46; Rhodes and Osborne 2003: 54.
[100] On this point and Isocrates (9. 51 and 55, tr. Norlin), see Lewis and Stroud 1979: 190.

honoring illustrious foreigners, and a statue in the agora was a way to honor a foreigner Athens wanted to reward highly but who had already received honorific citizenship. As Isocrates points out, the statues of Conon and Evagoras were "a memorial of the *magnitude* of their benefactions."[101] Pharnabazus received no honors because he was Persian, not because he was not a citizen. Moreover, a search for the symbolic connotations of the Evagoras statue should not prevent us from recognizing that its primary function was to gratify the benefactor: this is probably why, against the custom, he is treated as a *basileus*[102] and is one of the reasons for the erection of his statue in the agora.[103]

In any event, the door opened in 393 BC to rewarding citizens with statues. Shortly afterward, the beneficiary was Iphicrates, another talented commander.[104] During the Corinthian War, in 390 BC, Iphicrates and his peltasts wiped out a Spartan *mora* (*ca*. 600 hoplites).[105] This was the largest Spartan defeat since the capture of Sphacteria by Cleon in 425 BC,[106] and in the land war against Sparta, it represented something similar to Conon's naval victory at Cnidus.[107] Iphicrates was awarded *sitêsis* in the prytaneion and *proedria* (like Cleon), and a statue in the agora (like Conon) – in other words, the *megistai timai* of Harmodius and Aristogiton.[108] That he received these honors as a reward for his destruction of the Spartan *mora* is certain, thanks to the testimony of Aeschines: "they honored ... Iphicrates because he destroyed a regiment of the Lacedaemonians."[109] The location of the statue in the agora can be inferred from the fact that Aeschines mentions it together with other commander statues erected there, and another source says that Iphicrates received the same honors as Harmodius and Aristogiton. The Iphicrates statue seen by Pausanias on the acropolis was probably a votive statue, although it has been identified with the one awarded to Iphicrates.[110]

[101] Isoc. 9. 57 (tr. Norlin). [102] Lewis and Stroud 1979: 188.

[103] For a different interpretation of Evagoras' statue, J. Shear 2007: 108; J. Shear 2011: 256, 274–80 (Pausanias' reference should indicate that Evagoras' Athenian citizenship was cited on the monument's base, and that he, like Conon, was honored as an Athenian democrat and tyrant slayer; there was no place for honors for non–Athenian benefactors in the agora).

[104] The date is controversial, since D.H. *De Lysia judicum* 12. 5 has been taken to imply that Iphicrates was not honored until 371/0 BC. But Gauthier 1985: 177–80 has shown that the most likely date is around 389 BC. See now also J. Shear 2007: 110 n. 75.

[105] X. *HG* 4. 5. 7. ff.; D.S. 14. 91. 2–3. [106] Pritchett 1974: 122. [107] Gauthier 1985: 98.

[108] Aeschin. 3. 243 (statue); D. 23. 130, 136 (statue, *sitêsis*, and "other honors"); schol. D. 21. 62 (all the honors granted to Harmodius and Aristogiton); Arist. *Rh*. 1397^{b}27–30 (statue).

[109] Aeschin. 3. 243 (tr. Adams).

[110] Aeschin. 3. 243; schol. D. 21. 62; Paus. 1. 24. 7; Dillon 2006: 105: "surely a private votive dedication"; see also J. Shear 2007: 110 n. 76; Kremmydas 2012: 336. The acropolis statue is identified with the statue awarded to Iphicrates, for example, by Harris 2008: 109 n. 116.

Two other generals granted statues in the agora (Conon and Timotheus) also had votive statues on the acropolis.[111]

This extraordinary act of honoring was not without critics. A certain Harmodius, a descendant of the Tyrannicide, at any rate, was against it. A fragment of Iphicrates' speech against this Harmodius (attributed to Lysias) observes:

> Thus Iphicrates, in his speech against Harmodius, says: "If, before accomplishing anything, I had demanded the statue from you in the event of my success, you would have granted it; will you then refuse it, now that I have succeeded?"[112]

The implication is that Iphicrates, like Cleon, demanded honors without waiting for the demos to grant them to him.[113] It is also clear that the issue was not that Iphicrates had taken the initiative, but the question of whether his accomplishment deserved such honors. The suggestion that if Iphicrates had asked in advance to be granted a statue in the event of success, his request would have been granted is not to be taken literally but is only a way of saying that his performance was a great benefaction. But the remark also leaves no doubt that it was common to think of rewards before the benefactions occurred; Iphicrates' rhetorical turn was proper to a society in which the honors bestowed on foreign benefactors often had a proleptic nature. A similar phenomenon is apparent in Andocides' *On his Return*, although in that case the negotiation of the reward in advance is not hypothetical but real: Andocides intended his civic rights to be restored in return for a benefaction – the corn supply – that he had not yet performed or that he was just beginning to perform ("services which I am about to render, which I have, in fact, already begun to render").[114]

The next Athenian commander honored with a statue in the agora was Chabrias, Iphicrates' successor as a general in the Peloponnese;[115] fragments of the base have been found.[116] Chabrias also received a gold crown,[117] *ateleia*,[118] and other honors (*dôreai*),[119] among which were allegedly *sitêsis* and *proedria*. According to Aeschines and Demosthenes, the motive for honoring him was his victory over Sparta at the battle of Naxos (376 BC),

[111] Paus. 1. 24. 3. Dillon 2006: 105; Krumeich and Witschel 2009: 188.
[112] Lys. fr. 49 Carey; Arist. *Rh.* 1397^{b}27–30. [113] See Gauthier 1985: 98.
[114] And. 2. 19 (tr. Maidment).
[115] Aeschin. 3. 243; Arist. *Rh.* 1411^{b}6–7; Nep. 12. 1; D.S. 15. 33. 4.
[116] Burnett and Edmonson 1961: 74–91; *SEG* XIX 204. [117] D. 24. 180. See Sealey 1993: 284.
[118] D. 20. 75, 79, 86, 146.
[119] Aeschin. 3. 243. D. 20. 146 says that Chabrias' rewards (*dôrea*) "included *among other things* the gift of immunity."

which restored Athens' supremacy in the Aegean.[120] Nonetheless, a document used by Demosthenes, which may have been attached by Chabrias to his petition for honors, mentions the latter's main accomplishments prior to Naxos.[121] Although Chabrias was officially honored for his victory there, he seems to have intended to reinforce his petition with a list of benefactions. Like Iphicrates, he faced opposition, for Demosthenes mentions a certain Leodamas "who impeached the grant (*dôrea*) to Chabrias but lost the case.[122]

A final "great *euergetês*" is Conon's son Timotheus, who received his reward – a statue in the agora next to his father's[123] – for a victory over a Spartan fleet at Alyzia a year after Chabrias' success at Naxos.[124] Timotheus' victory contributed to the consolidation of the Second Athenian Confederacy (378–355 BC), but his statue cannot be regarded only as recompense for a benefaction. It also represented a way to celebrate the foundation of the new confederacy, and Samos and Ephesus both erected statues of Timotheus next to their statues of Chabrias.[125] While the statue of Conon signaled the beginning of the recovery of the polis, that of Timotheus, placed next to the stele from 377 BC that recorded the charter of the Second Athenian Confederacy ("the Aristoteles decree"),[126] symbolized the culmination of this recovery. The kinship between the two figures, and the association of ideas it implied, helped present the period from one victory to the next as a consistent process: what started at Cnidus culminated at Alyzia. Moreover, the Athenians used this association of ideas both to reinforce the impression that the victory at Cnidus was their own (since the victory at Alyzia was in fact genuinely Athenian) and to color the less impressive victory at Alyzia[127] with the story of Cnidus (where the Spartans were annihilated).[128]

Other commanders apart from Conon, Iphicrates, Chabrias, and Timotheus might have been honored with *megistai timai* or at least a statue,[129] but they cannot have been many, since the sources refer only to the four discussed earlier. In the first half of the fourth century, in fact, the Athenians remained unenthusiastic about honoring their fellow-

[120] Aeschin. 3. 243; Demosthenes (20. 77) does not say this explicitly, but his words make it obvious that this is what he understood.
[121] Gauthier 1985: 100–101. [122] D. 20. 146. [123] Aeschin. 3. 243; Nep. 13. 2. 3; Paus. 1. 3. 2.
[124] X. *HG* 5. 4. 62–6; D.S. 15. 36. 5. See Sealey 1993: 61. [125] Paus. 6. 3. 16. [126] *IG* II^2 43.
[127] Sealey 1993: 61: "in itself the battle was not decisive."
[128] The controversial Acanthus Column in Delphi would be part of this context, if it were really erected by the Athenians in 375 to commemorate the victory at Alyzia; cf. Ridgway 1990: 23–6; Ajootian 1996: 93. On the historical background, see Hunt 2010: 242–3.
[129] Aeschin. 3. 143.

citizens, particularly with *megistai timai*. As for the four "great *euergetai*" honored with statues and other great distinctions, in at least two cases (Conon and Timotheus) political motives (self-representation of the community and manipulation of collective memory) played a role. The devaluation of traditional honors such as crowns has been noted. But the figure of the military commander had also changed considerably since before the Peloponnesian War. War had become a more complex activity that required significantly more time and knowledge. Commanders were something close to "professionals," who devoted almost all their time to fighting with troops they paid at least in part themselves.[130] As a result, victories were far more often identified with the commanders themselves than they had been in the fifth century. To some degree, generals were like athletes who went off to compete and brought glory to the polis, and who therefore deserved honor. On the other hand, their dedication to war left fourth-century generals little time for politics. They were less interested in political support than fifth-century generals such as Nicias and Alcibiades had been, and much more concerned about official rewards that would reflect the glory of their deeds.

2.2 *Responding to financial challenges*

For the Athenians, one dramatic consequence of defeat in the Peloponnesian War was the loss of the financial resources drawn from the empire, which coincided with an interruption in the income from the state-owned silver mines.[131] Although the Second Athenian Confederacy led to a recovery of sorts, it was never a source of income comparable to that of the Delian League. After the Social War (357–355 BC), the financial situation of the polis deteriorated again, and Chaeronea represented a further setback.[132] In the fourth century, therefore, the Athenian state had to do even more emphatically what it had already begun to do during the final phase of the Peloponnesian War to finance its main activities, particularly military operations: it turned to its wealthiest citizens and metics for economic assistance.

Athens tried to extract resources from the rich through liturgies and extraordinary obligatory contributions (*eisphorai*) rather than voluntary donations.[133] The system of liturgies, which from an economic point of

[130] Gauthier 1985: 126. [131] French 1991: 33; Cohen 1992: 194–5; R. Osborne 2010: 134.
[132] Hakkarainen 1997: 2, 4; Engen 2010: 65, 69, 216, 220; Faraguna 2011: 78.
[133] On the obligatory character of liturgies, see Mann 2007: 161; Christ 2012: 69–70; Pownall 2013: 292–3.

view may have seemed superfluous when Delian League money was flowing into Athens, proved helpful during the critical years of the Decelean War (413–404 BC). For a polis as complex as Athens in a financially difficult situation, it was imperative to be able to project income in advance and force unwilling contributors to pay. After the Peloponnesian War, the extent to which the Athenian elite was disposed to cooperate financially was unclear. Unlike members of the archaic elite, who enjoyed many privileges, the fourth-century elite felt no need to compensate the demos. What is more, the oligarchic regimes of 411 BC and 404/3 BC had shown that part of this elite did not identify with the democratic polis and could not be expected to sympathize with its financial difficulties.

In addition to these pragmatic reasons, the liturgical system had symbolic connotations: its application under the new circumstances showed who had been victorious in the sociopolitical conflicts of the late fifth century and was now in control of the polis, an aspect that mattered to a demos averse to financial dependence on the wealthy. In principle, it may also have seemed advantageous that the system did not oblige the demos to publicly acknowledge its dependence on contributors by granting them honors; technically, their services were civic duties. As I will argue, however, this perception was inaccurate.

Liturgies, eisphorai*, and* epidoseis

After the Peloponnesian War and throughout the fourth century, many members of the elite claim to have spent large amounts on *eisphorai*[134] or to have performed numerous costly liturgies,[135] with the emphasis on choregies and trierarchies, the most expensive services. Some individuals also complain about *eisphorai* and liturgies[136] or try to avoid them either through legal mechanisms such as *skepsis* and *antidosis*[137] or by concealing their wealth.[138] The picture that emerges is of substantial financial pressure on the Athenian elite.

[134] Lys. 18. 7; 19. 29, 57; 25. 12; 30. 26. See also Thomsen 1964: 147–9.
[135] Lys. 19. 29, 57; Is. 5. 41; 6. 38; 7. 38; Isoc. 15. 145, 158; D. 36. 41; 45. 85.
[136] Lys. 28. 3; 29. 4; Isoc. 8. 128; D. 2. 24; 8. 21–3.
[137] Gabrielsen 1987; Christ 1990: 149–50, 160–2; Christ 2006: 159–60. See for example X. *Oec.* 7. 3; [Arist.] *Ath.* 56. 3; Isoc. 15 *passim*; D. 21. 156; 42 *passim*. More examples of *antidosis* in Gabrielsen 1987: 10–11 nn. 9 and 11; Christ 1990: 163 n. 78.
[138] Lys. 2. 24; 32. 23; Isoc. 7. 35; 15. 160; 17. 1–11; Is. 2. 47–9; 4. 29; 5. 35; 7. 40; 11. 47; Aeschin. 1. 101; D. 14. 25; 28. 7, 22–4; 45. 66. On concealment of wealth, see Gabrielsen 1986; Christ 1990: 157–60; Cohen 1992: 191–3; Christ 2006: 191–4. On individuals attempting to avoid liturgies, see also Lys. 21. 12; Is. 5. 35–7; D. 20. 1; 21. 154–5; 42. 22–3; 45. 66; Aeschin. 1. 101–2.

Some defendants must have exaggerated the amount of their contributions, in the hope of obtaining *charis* from juries. Others certainly complained about liturgies and *eisphorai* for reasons that had nothing to do with fiscal stress. Some may have considered the way liturgies were assigned unfair, since not all members of the liturgical class contributed the same amount.[139] Others may have believed that the money required for *eisphorai* and liturgies was wasted on pointless wars and overly sumptuous spectacles.[140] And a number of elite citizens certainly opposed liturgies and *eisphorai* simply because they were an imposition by the demos and alienated property rights.[141] Moreover, complaints about liturgies and attempts to evade them are not unique to the fourth century but existed already in the fifth, when Athens was prosperous;[142] we need only recall the passage from the Old Oligarch cited in Chapter 4, Section 1.2.[143]

It nonetheless seems clear that in the fourth century, the wealthiest citizens suffered under heavy financial burdens. Liturgies entailed expenses ranging from 300 drachmas (the yearly earnings of a craftsman at the time) to 6,000 (a quarter to a third of the net assets of many liturgists). There is also evidence of individual *eisphora* payments of up to 3,000 to 4,000 drachmas.[144] Sometimes the individuals required to pay the *proeisphora* (advance payment of the entire *eisphora* levied on a tax group or *symmoria*) ended up paying more than they were supposed to, because some individuals simply failed to contribute.[145] Although the patrimonies of wealthy families were generally stable from the fourth to the second centuries,[146] obligatory contributions appear to have amounted to a substantial portion of some men's fortunes and at times even posed a threat to their economic security.[147] We know of several individuals who had to borrow money to complete their

[139] Christ 1990: 154–5. [140] Cf. Arist. *Pol.* 1309[a]14–19; Isoc. 7. 53–5.
[141] See for example X. *Smp.* 4. 45, where Callias implies that the rich are treated as slaves by the state.
[142] Christ 1990: 151; Christ 2006: 157–61.
[143] [X.] *Ath.* 1. 13. As indicated, the Old Oligarch probably wrote at the time of the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War.
[144] On these amounts and equivalences, see Cohen 1992: 196. On the cost of liturgies, see also Davies 1981: 82; Christ 1990: 148; Gabrielsen 1994: 105–7; Christ 2006: 175.
[145] [D.] 50. 9. On this passage and the *proeisphora*, see Cohen 1992: 196–7.
[146] Davies 1971; Daverio-Rocchi 1978: 35.
[147] Lys. 7. 31–2; 18. 3; 19. 9, 29, 57–9; 26. 22; 28. 3; 29. 4; 30. 26; X. *HG* 6. 2. 1; *Smp.* 4. 30–2; Isoc. 8. 128; 12. 12, 145; 15. 160; Is. 4. 27; 6. 60–1; 7. 40; D. 1. 8–9; 18. 102; 21. 61; 24. 197–8; 28. 17; 38. 26; [D.] 47. 54; 50. 8–9; 52. 26; D.S. 13. 47. 7, 52. 5. Unsurprisingly, some statements exaggerate the economic harm done by liturgies and *eisphorai*. But see Davies 1981: 85–6; Christ 1990: 153; Millett 1991: 68–9; Christ 2006: 173–6.

liturgies,[148] and had it not been possible to evade liturgies, more rich men would certainly have got into economic trouble.[149]

Important testimony to the economic pressure on wealthy citizens as a consequence of liturgies and *eisphorai* is found in Xenophon's *Oeconomicus*, which probably dates after 362 BC. Addressing Critobulus, Socrates refers to the burden of liturgies and their obligatory character backed by the threat of punishment:

> I observe already the state is exacting heavy contributions from you: you must keep horses, pay for choruses and gymnastic competitions, and accept presidencies; and if war breaks out, I know they will require you to maintain a ship and pay taxes that will nearly crush you. Whenever you seem to fall short of what is expected of you, the Athenians will certainly punish you as though they had caught you robbing them.[150]

Although we do not have many fifth-century sources allowing us to compare the condition of the liturgical class then with the fourth century,[151] there can be no doubt that the well-off came under considerably more financial pressure as time passed. Isocrates (writing *ca*. 350 BC) explains the situation as follows:

> For, when I was a boy, wealth was regarded as a thing so secure, as well as admirable, that almost everyone affected to own more property than he actually possessed, because he wanted to enjoy the standing it gave. Now, on the other hand, a man has to be ready to defend himself against being rich as if it were the worst of crimes, and to keep on the alert if he is to avoid disaster; for it has become far more dangerous to be suspected of being well off than to be detected in crime; for criminals are pardoned or let off with slight penalties, while the rich are ruined utterly, and it will be found that the number of men who have been deprived of their property is greater than those who have been punished for their misdeeds.[152]

Despite these circumstances, some citizens still spent more than was stipulated for liturgies, or assumed them voluntarily when it was not their turn. A client of Lysias, defending himself against the charge of having taken bribes shortly after the end of the Peloponnesian War, declares: "Of these sums that I have enumerated, had I chosen to limit the public services to the letter of the law, I should have spent not one

[148] Lys. 19, 25; D. 1.13, 17; 28. 17; [D.] 47. 54; 50. 7, 13; 53. 9, 12–13. It is nonetheless true that lack of cash does not always imply lack of wealth.
[149] Christ 2006: 204.
[150] X. *Oec*. 2. 6 (tr. Marchant, slightly adapted). Other good examples are Isoc. 8. 128 (from 355 BC); 15. 60; Antiph. fr. 202 K–A (from *ca*. 349 BC) (see Christ 1990: 154).
[151] Christ 1990: 151. [152] Isoc. 15. 159–60 (tr. Norlin, slightly adapted).

quarter." Isocrates claims that he and his son performed "services more generously and handsomely than the laws require." Demosthenes highlights on more than one occasion his voluntary services: "That was in the early days of the volunteer trierarchs, of whom I was one";[153] and "I came forward and volunteered to act as a chorus-master."[154] Other men agreed to perform liturgies despite being legally exempt from them. Thus Isaeus stresses that one man "did not intermit his duties for two years but served continuously."[155] Regardless of their accuracy, statements like these could be made without sounding implausible.

Evidence for individuals voluntarily spending money on liturgies, however, is limited, especially if we consider the forensic character of most sources that discuss liturgies and the many exaggerations they may contain. The emphasis some defendants place on having voluntarily spent money on liturgies also suggests that the behavior was exceptional.[156] In addition, some sources may not reflect "true" voluntarism; some men voluntarily performed liturgies for strategic reasons (e.g., they volunteered for a choregy to avoid a trierarchy[157]), and the difference between voluntary and obligatory service was not always clear, since many types of pressures make people feel obliged to "volunteer."[158] But none of this should lead to the conclusion that almost no member of the Athenian elite wanted to contribute financially to the polis.[159] The frequency with which wealthy men were asked to contribute made it unnecessary for those willing to serve the polis to volunteer. Nor can it be taken for granted that volunteer liturgies were always considered the greatest service. Accepting a liturgy when no one volunteered for it, and in a time when skipping liturgies was common, may have been considered more of a service than volunteering for a liturgy when this could be understood as a strategic move. The forensic literature indicates that what really mattered was serving the

[153] Lys. 21. 5 (tr. Lamb); Isoc. 15. 145 (tr. Norlin); D. 18. 99 (tr. Vince).

[154] D. 21. 13 (tr. Vince). Later on, Demosthenes emphasizes the difference between volunteering for a liturgy and performing it under obligation: "He has once equipped a tragic chorus; I have furnished a band of male pipe-players; and everyone knows that the latter involves much greater expense than the former. *Moreover my service was voluntary*" (D. 21. 156, tr. Vince, slightly adapted).

[155] Is. 7. 38 (tr. Forster). See also Lys. 19. 29; more examples of voluntary liturgies or of individuals spending generously on liturgies in Lys. 7. 31; 19. 63; 25. 13; 29. 4; D. 38. 26; 45. 78, 85.

[156] See Christ 1990: 156.

[157] Christ 2006: 174–5, 195.

[158] Cf. D. 45. 78.

[159] The degree of engagement of the Athenian liturgical class is a controversial topic. Cohen 1992: 193–9, believes that wealthy Athenians were fundamentally opposed to liturgies. Christ 2006: 144–6, 169, 171, 177–8, 180–2 also highlights the opposition to the institution, although he does not dismiss the possibility that some Athenians were driven to perform liturgies by the pursuit of prestige and the advantages derived from it. Gabrielsen 1994, Millett 1991: 67–71, and Wilson 2000, by contrast, underline the importance of those aspects.

polis, and that the voluntary aspect of that service was of secondary importance. The role played by factors such as patriotism, an inclination to display one's own superior social condition, and the benefits of symbolic capital (particularly useful to individuals pursuing a political career) must be taken into account as well.[160] Liturgies provided *timê* (honor). Socrates accordingly reminds Glaucon in Xenophon's *Memorabilia*, "Well, Glaucon, as you want to win honor, is it not obvious that you must benefit your polis?"[161] All these forces, which help explain voluntary donations in the Hellenistic polis, were at work in fourth-century Athens and must have led some citizens to perform their services without reluctance and perhaps even with enthusiasm. The existence of donations such as the ones discussed in the following section corroborates this impression.

Voluntarism was at the core of another Athenian response to the city's financial problems: the organization of *epidoseis* (public subscriptions). These are documented from *ca*. 425 BC on and became more and more frequent in the course of the fourth century.[162] The majority were related to military operations, but contributions were also sought for purposes such as sacrifices or the purchase of grain. The way *epidoseis* were organized was discussed in detail in Chapter 1. Here it will be enough to recall that they normally included a resolution by the assembly encouraging citizens to make gifts, the act of pledging contributions, the payments themselves, and the publication of a list of subscribers (before or after the promises were fulfilled).

Choregies, trierarchies, *eisphorai, symmoriai*, and *epidoseis* all represent stages in the movement toward the private donations characteristic of Hellenistic euergetism, and reflect the progressive euergetization of the Athenian financial system. While a choregos' service was partially overshadowed by the performances of the poet and the chorus, and the most immediate beneficiary was the tribe, a trierarch's service was more to the forefront, and the direct beneficiary was the polis as a whole. *Eisphorai* represent a step further, in the sense that these were strictly monetary contributions to the polis not linked to any performance (except when the contributor was in charge of a *symmoria*). Furthermore, the organization of trierarchies through *symmoriai* transformed these services for most liturgists into mere monetary payments. Finally, *epidoseis* were already voluntary contributions (at least in theory), but they were different from the typical gifts of the Hellenistic *euergetai* in one important aspect: their

[160] Cf. Arist. *Pol*. 1309[a]18–21. [161] X. *Mem*. 3. 6. 3 (tr. Marchant).
[162] Faraguna 1992: 383; Migeotte 1992: 9–11; Hakkarainen 1997: 12–13; Faraguna 2011: 78.

collective character (which does not mean that there were no *epidoseis* in the Hellenistic period).[163] At the same time that they anticipated the donations of Hellenistic euergetism, they signified a certain resistance to the new trend: behind the collective character of the *epidoseis* was not only pragmatism (the goal being to collect as much money as possible) but also the idea that moderate donations by many members of the community were preferable to large donations by a few (and there was sometimes even a fixed maximum amount[164]). *Epidoseis*, however, were not unproblematic. Although their collective character reduced tensions, their other main feature – voluntarism – was potentially a source of conflict because of the lack of involvement of citizens who had the means to participate but chose not to do so, and also because of the idea that citizens should contribute according to their means; wealthy citizens who did not make large donations were criticized. Demosthenes, for instance, implies that the contributors to the *epidoseis* that took place after Chaeronea were – as Harvey Yunis puts it – "'wealthy' but not the 'wealthiest.'"[165] In fact, Demosthenes was accused – unjustly – by Dinarchus of not having participated in those *epidoseis* "at a time when everyone else was contributing from his own money."[166] Demosthenes for his part accuses Aeschines of the same lack of solidarity on the occasion of the *epidoseis* organized when Alexander was marching on Thebes in 335 BC: "You incorrigible knave, even at the time when every man who ever spoke from the tribune gave freely to the national defense, when at last even Aristonicus gave the money he had collected to redeem his citizenship, you never came forward and put your name down for a farthing. And yet you were certainly not without means."[167] In the time of the Corinthian War (395–386 BC), Isaeus criticizes Dicaeogenes because "he has never contributed anything, except that after the capture of Lechaeum (392 BC), at the request of another citizen, he promised in the public assembly a subscription of 300 drachmas, a smaller sum than Cleonymus the Cretan" – that is, less than a foreigner contributed.[168]

The question of the size of the contribution was less problematic in a new type of *epidosis* introduced in 357 BC, in which all contributions were

[163] See the examples discussed in Chapter 1. [164] Migeotte 1992: 316–17.
[165] D. 18. 171. Yunis 2001: 206. On the interpretation of these contributions as *epidoseis*, see Migeotte 1992: 19.
[166] Din. 1. 80 (tr. Burtt).
[167] D. 18. 312 (tr. Vince). On the historical circumstances, see Migeotte 1992: 20.
[168] Is. 5. 37 (tr. Forster). The 300 drachmas were not actually a small amount, if we consider the size of other comparable *epidoseis* (Migeotte 1992: 12).

very large: the naval *epidosis*.[169] The first naval *epidosis* was organized for the expedition to Euboea in the summer of 357 BC, and Demosthenes was among the contributors. It was followed by *epidoseis* on the occasion of a campaign to Olynthus in 349 BC, a new expedition to Euboea in 348 BC (in support of Plutarch of Eretria), and an operation to help Callias of Chalcis in 340 BC.[170] There are hints of other possible *epidoseis*, but in these cases it is unclear whether the contributions were responses to public subscriptions or spontaneous, isolated acts of generosity. The noun *epidosis* ("donation") and the verb *epididonai* can refer to contributions that did not take place under public subscriptions, but the use of *epidoseis* as a *terminus technicus* has led scholars to see public subscriptions where none existed.[171]

Exactly what was contributed in naval *epidoseis* is also less evident than it may appear. It was long believed that the contribution consisted of the performance of a voluntary trierarchy, the assumption of the cost of running a ship without commanding it, the donation of a ship, or a combination of some of these acts.[172] Gabrielsen, however, argues that it is unlikely that ships were donated, so when a source speaks of the donation of a ship, the reference is in fact to a voluntary trierarchy or simply to undertaking the expense of operating the ship. Thus when we read that Hyperides, for the expedition to assist Callias of Chalcis, "in his own name and his son's name gave (*epedôke*) two triremes," we should not (with Migeotte and others) take this to mean that Hyperides really gave two ships.[173] The main point of Gabrielsen's argument is his demonstration that private individuals did not own warships. He devotes less effort, however, to proving that donating a ship cannot mean paying for its construction – he only mentions a few concrete cases in which this possibility comes into question and then dismisses them; as a consequence, his interpretation has not been universally accepted.[174]

Even if there were no donations of ships, however, a major feature of naval *epidoseis* that clearly distinguishes them from regular *epidoseis* is the magnitude of the contributions. From this point of view, the step taken in

[169] The date can be inferred from D. 21. 161. See Migeotte 1983: 140; Migeotte 1992: 16–17; Gabrielsen 1994: 203.
[170] Euboea: D. 21. 161; Plu. *Mor.* 850f. Olynthus: D. 21. 161; Philochorus *FGrH* 328 F 49. Euboea (second time): D. 21. 161–5. Callias: Plu. *Mor.* 849f (cf. Migeotte 1983: 143).
[171] Künzi 1923 and Pritchett 1991: 473–9 thought they had identified numerous *epidoseis*, but see Migeotte 1983.
[172] Künzi 1923; Migeotte 1983; Pritchett 1991: 473–9; Migeotte 1992: 16–17.
[173] Plu. *Mor.* 849f (tr. Fowler). Cf. Migeotte 1992: 18.
[174] Gabrielsen 1994: 201–6. *Contra* MacDowell 2009: 128.

357 BC can be said to represent a euergetization of the institution of the *epidosis*. Moreover, this step also supposed a euergetization of the *triêrarchia*: when the performance of the trierarchy was linked to an *epidosis*, the trierarchy moved from the ambiguous realm of the liturgy – where it was not clear if the service was a benefaction or a return – to the field of euergetism. Like every contribution in an *epidosis*, the voluntary trierarchy performed in such a context was a gift (*dôrea*), an act worthy of a reward normally stipulated in the appeal of the *epidosis*. Thus Demosthenes stresses that in the *epidosis* of the expedition to Euboea of 348 BC, Niceratus and Euctemon "each as an act of grace and a free gift (*dôrea*) supplied the state with a ship ready for sea."[175]

But the integration of *triêrarchiai* into *epidoseis* must have had a further consequence, accentuating the perception that trierarchies and the covering of operating costs undertaken outside an *epidosis* were also gifts. Such services existed long before the establishment of naval *epidoseis*.[176] Xenophon says of Antiphon that during the Peloponnesian War he "supplied from his own means two fast-sailing triremes," and Lysias speaks of a voluntary liturgy by Philocrates in his speech against him of 388 BC.[177] But actions like these participated in the ambiguity that surrounded liturgies. This cannot have been the case in similar actions after 357. Possible examples are triremes contributed by Demosthenes to three successive campaigns that, according to Migeotte, took place in the years 341 BC and 340/39 BC, and other triremes mentioned in a naval report of 334/3 BC.[178]

Finally, one can assume that the fact that voluntary trierarchies within *epidoseis* were clearly gifts and that, as result, voluntary trierarchies outside *epidoseis* were more easily seen as gifts, must have stimulated contributions in the form of trierarchies not only in *epidoseis* but also outside them. It must also have stimulated donations of other sorts, such as the money given by Demosthenes "when the people freed Euboea" in 341 BC.[179]

Gifts in office and private donations

In the fourth century, some members of the Athenian elite made contributions outside the context of liturgies, *eisphorai*, and *epidoseis*, normally

[175] D. 21. 165 (tr. Murray).
[176] Migeotte 1983: 139; Gabrielsen 1994: 203 (the example of Pasion, however, is of a man who was not a citizen and was performing benefactions to gain citizenship).
[177] X. *HG* 2. 3. 40 (tr. Brownson); cf. Plu. *Mor.* 832f; Lys. 29. 7.
[178] On Demosthenes' triremes, see Plu. *Mor.* 850f; the dates are controversial (see the later discussion of the Demochares proposal). On the other examples, *IG* II^2 1623. In general, Migeotte 1992: 18.
[179] Plu. *Mor.* 850f. But the amount cited in the source – eight talents – is implausible. On the date, see Migeotte 1983: 142–3; Migeotte 1992: 18.

during the exercise of a public office and sometimes – but much less frequently – without holding office. The polis could not afford to reject these gifts, as it did in the time of Pericles, at least with large gifts. Most of the evidence comes from the second half of the century, because donations of this kind were more common then, but also because the practice of publicly rewarding them – often the only indication of the existence of donations – did not become widespread until that point. In addition, decrees conferring honors on citizens – our main source of information for donations – were not inscribed on a regular basis until the 340s. This last circumstance, however, while it helps explain the scarcity of evidence for donations in the first half of the fourth century, is tricky in regard to further interpretation. On the one hand, since the inscription itself was a reward for the donor and had been the normal reward for foreign benefactors since the beginning of the fifth century, the fact that in the 340s the number of inscriptions for citizens radically increased, certainly reflects an increase in donations. On the other hand, not all citizens rewarded with inscriptions were donors, for some were recompensed solely for their performance. Even more important, the inscription of honorific decrees seems to have been not only a consequence of more benefactions – including donations – but the product of a change in the epigraphic habit: the decision to switch from a practice in which it was almost exclusively honorific decrees for foreigners that were inscribed to the inscription of honorific decrees for foreigners as well as citizens (which does not mean that all honorific decrees were inscribed). In conclusion, many more honorific decrees for citizens were probably passed in the first half of the fourth century than the evolution of the epigraphic record invites us to believe. As we will see, literary sources confirm this impression.[180]

The most famous case of donations made during the performance of a public function is Demosthenes' on the occasion of his supervision of the reconstruction of the city walls and his administration of the festival fund (*theôrikon*) in 337 BC. Demosthenes' friend Ctesiphon proposed rewarding these donations with the gold crown that is the subject of the orator's celebrated *On the Crown*, as well as of Aeschines' *Against Ctesiphon*. Demosthenes, who centers his defense on the wise, patriotic political advice he offered the city, does not say much about the gifts themselves.[181] But Aeschines puts the following argument in Demosthenes' mouth: "I am in charge of the construction of the walls,

[180] On the epigraphic habit, see Lambert 2011a; Meyer 2013.
[181] D. 18. 112–13, 117–19, 299, 311.

I admit it, but I have made a present of a hundred minas to the state, and I have carried out the work on a larger scale than was prescribed."[182]

But Demosthenes made more donations than this. We know some of them from Ps.-Plutarch's *Lives of the Ten Orators*, which reproduces a proposal made in the year 280/79 by Demosthenes' nephew Democharas, posthumously honoring his uncle and summarizing Demosthenes' benefactions over the course of his career. The text is generally regarded as authentic,[183] although the wording may differ from the original; the decree honoring Lycurgus, one of the other two documents added to the *Lives of the Ten Orators* – the second is a proposal to honor Democharas – is based on an original *psêphisma* replicated on an inscription.[184] Demosthenes is presented as a man who "has shown himself a public benefactor and counselor, and has brought about many benefits for the people of the Athenians, having *relinquished his property* for the common weal."[185] The list of accomplishments mentions political and diplomatic contributions, but the emphasis is on Demosthenes' economic benefactions:

- Contribution of eight talents and one trireme when "the people freed Euboea" in 341 BC.
- Contribution of a trireme to an expedition to the Hellespont in 340/39 BC (or 360/59 BC).
- Contribution of a trireme when Chares and Phocion were sent as generals to Byzantium in 340/39 BC.
- Ransom of many of those taken prisoner by Philip at Pydna, Methone, and Olynthus in 346 BC.
- Contribution of the expense of a chorus of men when the members of the tribe Pandionis failed to furnish this chorus in 348 BC.
- Provision of arms to citizens who lacked them.
- As commissioner of the fortifications, contribution of three talents for repair of the walls, in addition to the cost of two trenches around the Piraeus in 337 BC.[186]

[182] Aeschin. 3. 17 (tr. Adams). See also Plu. *Mor*. 845f–6a. Other wealthy Athenians may have contributed in a similar way: Aeschin. 3. 27.

[183] Plu. *Mor*. 850f–1c. Its authenticity is accepted by (among others) Habicht 1988: 7; MacDowell 2009: 24–6; Bayliss 2011: 107–8; Worthington 2013: 338.

[184] *IG* II^2 457 and 3207. The assumption is that the text of Democharas' proposal to honor Demosthenes was copied from the proposals kept with the decrees (or instead of the decrees) in the Athenian public records by the author of the *Lives of the Ten Orators*, or by someone else, perhaps Craterus (the author of a collection of decrees) (MacDowell 2009: 425). See also Lambert 2015.

[185] Plu. *Mor*. 850f (tr. Fowler, modified).

[186] The amount is 100 minas (rather than three talents) in Aeschin. 3. 17 and Plu. *Mor*. 845f.

- After the battle of Chaeronea (338 BC), donation of one talent, and after that, donation of another for food supplies in a time of scarcity.
- Through persuasion, benefactions, and advice, achievement of an alliance between Athens and the Thebans, Euboeans, Corinthians, Megarians, Achaeans, Locrians, Byzantines, and Messenians.
- Prevention of Peloponnesian support of Alexander against the Thebans, by giving money and going personally as an envoy.[187]

The emphasis on economic benefactions and the open manner in which the nature of those benefactions is expressed are not found in inscribed fourth-century decrees. The honorific statue proposed by Democharas for Demosthenes' benefactions is also unparalleled in the fourth century. The few honorific fourth-century statues known to us were awarded for a concrete service (although Conon's might be an exception). Nonetheless, the 280/9 decree offers valuable information about how certain contributions were perceived in the early third century and how they may have been perceived already in the fourth, even if the practice of rewarding benefactions was different then. Perceptions aside, the decree also informs us about actions: the kinds of contributions made by a representative member of the fourth-century elite.

Demosthenes in his speech *On the Crown* refers to other officeholders who spent money out of their own pockets. Nausicles, the general who confronted Philip at Thermopylae in 352 BC, was repeatedly honored for the money he spent as a commander. Diotimus and Charidemus, two other commanders, were crowned for donating shields, as Neoptolemus son of Anticles was for his donations as a commissioner of public works.[188] Charidamus' award dates before 335 BC, and Nausicles', Diotimus' and Neoptolemus' from the 330s.[189] By the time of Demosthenes' speech (330 BC), in fact, it had become normal for officials not only to make donations but also to be rewarded for them: "It would be quite intolerable that it should either be illegal for a man holding any office to make presents

[187] On the dates of those benefactions, cf. MacDowell 2009: 133–4, 425–6. MacDowell dates the donations of the time "when the people freed Euboea" to 357 BC (but see Migeotte 1983: 142–3; Migeotte 1992: 18). The date of 360/59 for the expedition to the Hellespont – proposed by MacDowell – results from an emendation of "Chephisodorus" (Plu. *Mor.* 850f) to "Cephisodotus" (cf. Aeschin. 3. 51); this is widely accepted, but see Migeotte 1983: 144; Migeotte 1992: 18, who proposes 340/39 BC.

[188] D. 18. 114. Cf. *IG* II^2 1496 (award of crowns). On these four benefactors, see Yunis 2001: 177–8. Diotimus received further honors at the proposal of Lycurgus (Plu. *Mor.* 844a; cf. *IG* II^3 336 and Lambert 2012a: 8, 43 no. 21). Charidemus had already been awarded other crowns by 353/2 BC (D. 23. 145, 188).

[189] See Christ 2006: 106; Canevaro 2013: 276, 280–1.

to the government, or that, when he has made them, instead of receiving thanks, he should be subjected to an audit."[190]

Hyperides offers another example of donations made while in office: his client Lycophron, in his third year as a *hipparchos* in Lemnos, paid his horsemen himself because he did not "wish to burden citizens in financial straits."[191] Additional information comes from inscriptions. In 333/2 BC, for example, Pytheas of Alopece, superintendent of wells, was honored for completing the construction of a sacred springhouse in the sanctuary of Ammon and for building another in the Amphiareum of Oropus. Apparently the projects were partially financed with his own money, and the honorary decree invites future officials to be similarly *philotimoi*. It is worth reproducing the main portion of the decree, not only because of the information it provides about this type of benefaction but also because it illustrates other aspects of Athenian civic euergetism discussed in Section 3.1:

> The people shall decide: since Pytheas, having been elected in charge of the water supply, is both fulfilling his other official duties well and with love of honor (*philotimôs*) and has now both constructed a new fountain at the sanctuary of Ammon and built the fountain in the Amphiareum and has taken care of the water channel and the underground conduits there, to praise Pytheas son of Sosidemus of Alopece, when he has rendered his accounts, and crown him with a gold crown of 1000 drachmas for his excellence and justice in his management of the water supply, in order that others who are elected in charge of the water supply may each of them also show love of honor (*philotimôntai*) towards the people.[192]

Another example is the Atthidographer Phanodemus of Thymaetadae, who was entrusted with reorganizing the festival of Amphiaraus and was crowned in 332/1 BC for his contributions to the cult and to the repair of the sanctuary. According to the decree, "he legislated well and with love of honor about the sanctuary of Amphiaraus, so that both the quadrennial festival may be as fine as possible, and the other sacrifices to the gods in the sanctuary of Amphiaraus, and he *supplied means for these things and for the fitting out of the sanctuary*."[193]

[190] D. 18. 114 (tr. Vince). The question of the need for an audit is discussed later.

[191] Hyp. 1. 17 (tr. Burtt). The citizens in question are Athenian cleruchs: Worthington, Cooper, and Harris 2001: 77.

[192] *IG* II^3 338 (tr. Lambert *AIO*); Habicht 1989: 83–4; Hakkarainen 1997: 21; Tully 2006; Lambert 2012a: 40–2.

[193] *IG* II^3 348 (tr. Lambert *AIO*). See Tracy 1995: 93; Mikalson 1998: 33; Humphreys 2004: 83–4; Lambert 2012a: 41 no. 16. Cf. Papazarkadas 2011: 45–8.

Financial contributions by officeholders were important in the diplomatic sphere. In the fourth century, the number of wealthy ambassadors gradually increased.[194] A remarkable example is the anonymous orator who was sent to (at a minimum) Thessaly, Macedonia, Molossia, Thesprotia, Italy, and Sicily.[195] When fourth-century speeches refer to embassies as services to the polis, the emphasis is normally on their success rather than their cost. But one activity associated with embassies visibly expresses the liberality of some wealthy Athenians: ransoming captive fellow-citizens. This type of service (or its absence) is mentioned repeatedly in the speeches to enhance or criticize individuals.[196] As just noted in regard to the Democharis decree, Demosthenes was active in this aspect of *philotimia* as well. He reminds his audience in the speech *On the Crown*: "If any of you are not aware that I have been generous and courteous, and helpful to the distressed, I do not mention it. I will never say a word, or tender any evidence about such matters as the captives I have ransomed."[197]

We know of private donations (gifts outside of office) for public building projects and utilities. Most instances date to the 330s BC and 320s BC, the period to which the donations by Pytheas of Alopece as superintendent of walls belong. Lycurgus, Demosthenes' successor as Athens' main leader from 338 BC to 324 BC, seems to have been successful in attracting private contributions to a building program whose scale has been compared with Pericles.'[198] The main projects were a Panathenaic stadium, a new gymnasium with a *palaestra*, continuation of the renovation of the Pnyx, improvements in the theater of Dionysus, a temple of Apollo Patroüs in the agora, a columned hall in the sanctuary of Asclepius, construction in the sanctuary of Demeter and Core in Eleusis and in the sanctuary of Amphiaraus in Oropus, repair of walls, and construction of ship sheds and arsenals for the storage of warships.[199] We have already seen how Demosthenes, while commissioner of fortifications, contributed to repairing the walls. We know as well that Lycurgus convinced a certain Deinias to donate land for the construction of the Panathenaic stadium, and that on Lycurgus' initiative Neoptolemus, the man mentioned earlier as the recipient of a crown, was also rewarded with a statue for covering the altar of

[194] Daverio-Rocchi 1978: 39. On the costs of embassies for the envoys, see Adcock and Mosley 1975: 155–6.
[195] [And.] 4. 41. [196] There is a comprehensive collection of evidence in Pritchett 1991: 245–7.
[197] D. 18. 268 (tr. Vince). See also D. 8. 70; 19. 40, 166–71; Plu. *Mor.* 851a.
[198] Plu. *Mor.* 852a–d; Habicht 1997: 8, 22–4.
[199] Hintzen-Bohlen 1997. See also Habicht 1997: 25–6; Humphreys 2004: 87–8; Pownall 2013: 299; Hanink 2014: 92–125.

Apollo in the agora with gold.[200] Likewise, Neoptolemus paid for the restoration of the temple of Artemis Aristoboule in his home deme of Melite, a benefaction for which he was honored by his demesmen.[201] It has been suggested that the Gate of Diochares located by Strabo near the Lyceum bears this name because Diochares son of Diocles of Pithus rebuilt it.[202] But under Lycurgus' administration, there must have been significant private donations for other purposes as well. If not, it is difficult to explain how he was able to increase public revenue from 600 to 1,200 talents per year, and to distribute 18,900 talents from these funds.[203] (The opening of new mine sites, leasing fees from new state land, and other sources of income combined with a reduction in expenses do not suffice to explain these numbers.[204]) Equally revealing is information contained in the decree to the effect that Lycurgus received substantial funds (650 talents) from private citizens; these were loans rather than donations, but they show the degree of involvement of private financing outside of the context of officeholding.[205] As Sally Humphreys notes, "the absence of building accounts from the Lycurgan period, apart from those of Eleusis noted by Rhodes, may be partly due to this reliance on private generosity."[206]

We have no clear evidence, however, of donations made by Lycurgus himself. The *Lives of the Ten Orators* says that "he was crowned by the people many times," and a letter attributed to Demosthenes asserts that "*during the lifetime* of Lycurgus [the Athenians] honored him extraordinarily."[207] We also know that Lycurgus regarded certain donations (spectacular trierarchies, the construction of walls, and having "subscribed generously from [one's] own property for the public safety"[208]) as benefactions to the community that deserved recognition. He was also active as an ambassador.[209] But while Democharés' proposal to honor Demosthenes focuses on his economic benefactions, the posthumous

[200] Plu. *Mor.* 841d (Deinias), 843f–4a (Neoptolemus); Hakkarainen 1997: 9, 28. On Neoptolemus, see Millett 1991: 159. Lycurgus was also able to obtain donations from noncitizens such as Eudemus of Plataia: *IG* II^3 352 = RO 94.

[201] *SEG* XXII 116.

[202] Str. 9. 1. 19; Faraguna 1992: 387. The name might, however, come instead from the bathhouse nearby (Humphreys 2004: 126 n. 49).

[203] Plu. *Mor.* 842f; 852b; cf. 841b, where the quantities differ.

[204] Habicht 1997: 23; Humphreys 2004: 85–6, 125–6; Pownall 2013: 299.

[205] Plu. *Mor.* 852b (cf. 841d). Humphreys 2004: 85 speaks of "donations." Cf. Migeotte 1984: 25–7; Faraguna 1992: 381–2.

[206] Humphreys 2004: 86. See also Rhodes 1985a: 220.

[207] Plu. *Mor.* 843c (tr. Fowler); D. *Ep.* 3. 6 (tr. DeWitt). See also Lambert 2015.

[208] Lycurg. 1. 139 (tr. Burtt).

[209] Plu. *Mor.* 841e.

Stratocles decree in honor of Lycurgus (307/6 BC) concentrates on management and legislative work. Lycurgus thus recalls Pericles not only for his building program but also for the type of benefactor he represents: a man whose reputation rests on redistribution of others' wealth rather than on his own personal contributions. The difference was that Pericles distributed money from the empire, that is, money that belonged to the Athenian demos, while a substantial part of the money distributed by Lycurgus came from the Athenian elite. As we will see, it was possible to claim that this money too belonged to the demos, but in the time of Lycurgus the idea that these were gifts was well established, as the honors awarded to donors show. I will return to this question.

Donations in office and private contributions not only increased in number in fourth-century Athens but also began to be decentralized, as more and more were directed to the demes. The two phenomena may be connected: it has been suggested that one response to the financial challenges of the time was to transfer administrative responsibilities that in the fifth century belonged to the polis to the demes.[210] The demes in turn, lacking sufficient financial resources of their own, had to rely on the assistance of their wealthiest members. Since the direct beneficiaries of this assistance were fellow demesmen, such individuals felt more pressure to donate than they would have had the donations been directed to the polis. There was accordingly an increase in donations in the fourth century, in part because many took place at the deme level. Eleusis may provide an example. We know from a decree passed by the boule and the ecclesia that in 421/0 BC the polis was in charge of repairing a bridge in Eleusis. In the fourth century, by contrast, the deme, assisted by its wealthy members, had to take care of the bridge.[211] This difference might nonetheless be explained differently. According to Robin Osborne, "which political body took responsibility for cult administration depended on which was informed of the problem," meaning that there was "a chance factor in the division of responsibility."[212]

But the demes did not contribute to the expansion of euergetism only via the contributions of their members. As I argue in Section 3.3, they also did so by profusely awarding honors to their benefactors. To understand this phenomenon – as well as the increase in euergetic honors granted by the polis – we must first consider how benefactions were perceived.

[210] On this phenomenon, see Daverio-Rocchi 1978.
[211] *IG* I³ 79; II² 1191. See also Daverio-Rocchi 1978: 38.
[212] R. Osborne 1985: 176.

2.3 New (and old) perceptions

In the fourth century, many liturgists and *eisphora* payers believed that they were doing more than fulfilling their duties as citizens, and that their contributions had crossed the line that separated the services good citizens owed the polis from gifts that deserved compensation. The feeling that their relationship of reciprocity with the rest of the community was out of balance can be detected in the following passage from Xenophon's *Poroi* (355 BC), which refers to the perception that those who paid *eisphorai* for warships spent large sums but received nothing in return:

> I am also aware that large expenditure is frequently incurred to send warships abroad, though none can tell whether the venture will be for better or worse, and the only thing certain is that the subscribers will never see their money back nor even enjoy any part of what they contribute.[213]

The context here must be kept in mind. Xenophon makes this observation to highlight the advantages of the funding system he proposes, in which contributors get returns. But I believe that Gauthier is right to point out that these lines reflect dissatisfaction with the *eisphora*: "the *eisphora* itself was called into question, or rather the meaning it had taken in the course of time." As Gauthier notes, the fact that this money could produce a victory and therefore benefit the whole community did not eliminate the sense that the lack of any personal return was unfair.[214]

The reasons that many liturgists and *eisphora* payers had a negative view of their obligatory contributions are less obvious than they seem at first. As I argued in Chapter 4, Section 1.2, there was a general belief – already visible in the Solonian class system – that every citizen had to contribute to the polis according to his capacities and means, which did not imply that the exchange between the rich and the rest of the community was necessarily unfair. In Greek gift-exchange, the equity of the exchange depended not only on the objective value of the gifts but also on what they represented to the giver in terms of costs and benefits. Those with more means (and who risked losing more if the polis collapsed) could reasonably be expected to make more substantial contributions.

This idea was still prevalent in the fourth century, as is apparent from Demosthenes' *On the Crown*.[215] As seen in the passage from Xenophon's *Oeconomicus* cited earlier, what the liturgist contributed to the polis was understood to be the property of the polis: "Whenever you seem to fall

[213] X. *Vect*. 3. 8 (tr. Marchant). Cf. Isoc. 8. 12.
[214] Gauthier 1976: 92 (my translation; original in French). [215] D. 18. 107 ff.

short of what is expected of you, the Athenians will certainly punish you as though *they had caught you robbing them*."[216] The problem was that the evaluation of costs and benefits could be inaccurate because of the characteristics of the exchange, such as disjunction.[217] Matters looked quite different, depending on whether or not one was a contributor. Probably ever since liturgies began, there had been rich individuals who thought that they contributed more than their share. The Old Oligarch certainly believed that. That some rich citizens thought in these terms, however, does not mean that none of them considered themselves obliged to contribute more than was required. If the survival of the polis was contingent on excessive contributions, some men must have regarded these as obligations; they thought it their duty to be benefactors. That the idea of "obligatory benefaction" existed is apparent from the fact that an obligation – an involuntary liturgy that did not surpass the minimum expense required by law – could be claimed as a benefaction in trials and could obtain *charis* from the jury.

During the prosperous years of the Delian League, Athens' wealthiest citizens did not cease to contribute more than the rest of the citizens, for the liturgy system inherited from the archaic polis was maintained. That their contributions were greater was such an old tradition in the fourth century that to some degree the situation was taken for granted, even though the status of the elite had changed a great deal since the archaic age. During much of the fifth century, moreover, liturgies had been both an imposition and a privilege. They were one of the few settings in which citizens could make gifts to the community and obtain the benefits such contributions brought, such as *timê*, symbolic capital, and the status that came from displaying one's wealth before the community. As regards this final aspect, we have already seen what Isocrates says about early times, in which wealthy citizens were under less pressure to donate money: "When I was a boy, wealth was regarded as a thing so secure as well as admirable, that almost every one affected to own more property than he actually possessed, because he wanted to enjoy the standing which it gave."[218] Moreover, when it came to the common good, the Athenians seem to have had a capacity to renounce reciprocity. This feature of Athenian society has been studied by Herman in relation to negative reciprocity[219] and may have affected relationships of positive reciprocity as well.

[216] X. *Oec*. 2. 6 (tr. Marchant). [217] See Chapter 1, Section 3.1.
[218] Isoc. 15. 159 (tr. Norlin, slightly adapted).
[219] A relationship in which a harmful action is responded to with an action that has a more or less equally negative effect on the recipient. Cf. Herman 2006.

But some liturgists and *eisphora* spenders certainly felt the distress apparent in the quoted passage from Xenophon, as a consequence of financial pressure on the liturgical class resulting from the rise in the number and frequency of liturgies and *eisphorai*, a development that threatened the economic security of some of its members;[220] a lack of identification with some activities their money financed in a polis controlled by the demos;[221] and a sense that they were victims of poorer citizens who envied their wealth.[222] In addition, fourth-century Athens was far from an ideal polis in which everyone contributed in accord with his capabilities and resources. Not until 340 BC were different levels of wealth among the rich taken into consideration for the assignment of trierarchies.[223] What is more, while some rich men paid, others (as noted) did not, as a consequence of imperfections in the liturgy system or of successful efforts to conceal wealth. A substantial sector of the population, moreover, although not rich, was far from poor, but nonetheless paid nothing. Liturgies were adequate for a polarized society like the archaic polis, in which the portion of the population that was neither rich nor poor was much smaller. It worked less well in the more complex society of the fourth century – a fact that offers further support for the thesis of the archaic origins of liturgies. As Christ observes, "a wealthy man did not have to be a closet oligarch to see inequality in the city's arrangements involving financial obligations."[224] The developments of the fourth century did not help make this inequality more acceptable. The discourse of the polis stressing that liturgies were duties played against the perception of generously performed liturgies as benefactions. The awareness that a significant number of wealthy citizens did not perform the liturgies they should had a similar effect. Even the reform of the trierarchic system in 357 BC, which spread the burden among more citizens, had negative results, since it offered fewer opportunities for individual performance and the benefits derived from it.[225] As a consequence, some of those who paid must have requested, at a minimum, to be recognized as benefactors. This is apparent above all in the speeches of the fourth-century orators. While in the assembly the rich seem to have hesitated to boast about their benefactions out of fear of being accused of *hybris*, in the courts the attacks to which they

[220] See Section 2.2.
[221] Note how Demosthenes criticizes "those who consider as lost whatever money they spend upon the state" (42. 25; tr. Murray).
[222] For the envy felt by poorer Athenians, see Ober 1989: 205–7.
[223] In the case of the *eisphorai*, this happened already in 378 BC. See Christ 2006: 187.
[224] Christ 2006: 186. [225] Sinclair 1988: 62, 190.

were subject, as well as the additional time available for argument, led them to develop an euergetic rhetoric to better defend themselves.[226]

3 The euergetic system

3.1 Continuity and innovation

After the Peloponnesian War, the demos continued to compensate liturgists and other financial contributors with informal rewards. One type of recompense particularly well documented because of the forensic character of many fourth-century sources was acquittal at trials. In a speech by Lysias from 399 BC, for example, the defendant says: "There have been cases, gentlemen of the jury, of persons who, when brought to trial, have appeared to be guilty, but who, on showing forth their ancestors' virtues and their own benefactions (*euergesiai*), have obtained your pardon."[227] Around the same time, another of Lysias' clients acknowledges that he performed benefactions with the intention of obtaining this type of counter-gift: "My purpose in spending more than was enjoined upon me by the city was to raise myself the higher in your opinion, so that if any misfortune should chance to befall me, I might defend myself on better terms."[228] But obtaining such a counter-gift was not easy, since the opponent generally attempted to show that the other party had not been as generous as he pretended, or that he himself had even been more generous.[229]

Although in the second half of the fifth century and throughout the fourth, political power exercised through wealth was increasingly displaced by power based on oratory, administrative aptitude, and diplomatic ability, the practice of rewarding financial contributors with political support persisted.[230] The same gratitude for contributions that might lead a jury to absolve a defendant must have influenced citizens when they elected magistrates. Such gratitude also served to provide support in the assembly. Demosthenes, for example, criticizes Meidias, a wealthy politician and his personal enemy, because in every assembly Meidias took the floor and described how much he contributed to the polis. Despite Demosthenes' criticisms ("he bores us at every assembly with these tasteless boasts"), the strategy must have worked; not only did Meidias insist on relying on it, but Demosthenes himself employed it, if more subtly. In his *On the*

[226] Cf. Ober 1989: 231; Mann 2007: 32. [227] Lys. 30. 1 (tr. Lamb).
[228] Lys. 25. 15 (tr. Lamb). See also D. 21. 151.
[229] See Christ 1990: 155, with examples in nn. 36 and 37; Christ 2006: 180–2.
[230] Cf. Davies 1981: 114–15; Rhodes 1986: 140–2; Mossé 1995.

Chersonesus, for example, he says: "if a man should say to me, 'speak for yourself, and tell us what good you have ever done the state,' though I might speak, men of Athens, of the equipment of war-galleys and of choruses, of money contributions and of the ransom of captives, and of other instances of liberality, I would say not a word of them."[231]

The proliferation of honors for commanders (from the statues of the "great *euergetai*" to more modest honors such as crowns), but above all the granting of honors to citizens who had performed benefactions of an economic nature in the context of military operations made it more difficult to deny honors for voluntary or generously performed liturgies, gifts to the polis while holding office, and private donations. In addition to the feeling of indebtedness aroused in the community by acts that were clearly benefactions, there was pressure from those who performed them, in a culture in which the right to be reciprocated was deeply rooted and it was natural for benefactors to demand honors without waiting for the state to take the initiative (as in the case of Cleon and some if not all of the "great *euergetai*").

Not all contributors pressed to obtain honors; what some members of the liturgical class wanted was instead to stop being required to perform liturgies. Other men, meanwhile, did not oppose liturgies and in fact had the resources to make voluntary contributions, but did not do so because they lacked incentives. The awarding of honors to financial benefactors was thus not only a response to the demands of those who sought to be publicly recognized but also a strategy of the polis to attract voluntary contributions. To some degree, this was a reaction to the system based on liturgies, which in the fourth century did not work as well as before and invited the exploration of alternative funding procedures.[232] This does not mean that honors were incorporated into the liturgy system; as we will see, they were not. But the systematic use of honors to obtain resources is related to the experience with liturgies.

This use of honors must also be understood in the context of Athens' increasing tendency toward administrative and financial sophistication. In the fourth century, the power of the financial offices was augmented and new ones were created;[233] budget policy was improved with the introduction of the *merismos*, a yearly distribution of fixed amounts of

[231] D. 21. 153 and 8. 70–71 (tr. Vince; cf. D. 21. 154, 157). On these two passages and for further examples, see Ober 1989: 231–2.

[232] There are divergent views on the efficiency of the liturgical system. I concur with Christ 2006: 155 that it was less effective than was alleged in earlier literature.

[233] Hakkarainen 1997: 5.

money to each spending board and office; a military fund (*stratiôtika*) was established no later than 378/7 BC;[234] another major fund, the theoric fund, was created or at least renovated in the time of Eubulus;[235] and the payment of *eisphorai* and the trierarchies were reorganized via the introduction of *symmoriai* (groups of contributors) in 378/7 BC and 357 BC, respectively.[236] The award of honors to ensure and encourage economic benefactions was to some extent a product of the same mentality that led to these reforms in the city's financial system. But honors also proved helpful in improving other branches of the administration and government of the polis when they were granted to officers and members of the boule to reward their performance.

Interestingly, around 355 BC, just before the Athenians began to consistently honor officers for their achievements, Xenophon proposed offering "prizes (*athla*) to the magistrates of the market for just and prompt settlement of disputes"; he thus suggests trying to improve the officials' performance by granting them rewards. The main difference between this plan and the system we find after the Social War is that Xenophon has in mind prizes (*athla*) rather than *dôreai*. In his next sentence of this passage of the *Poroi*, by contrast, he speaks of *proedria* and *xenia* (dinner in the prytaneion) for "merchants and shipowners . . . when the high quality of their ships and merchandise entitles them to be considered benefactors of the state." In other words, while he thinks of euergetism when he considers a strategy for foreigners, he still thinks of the liturgical system (with rewards only for the winners of the competition) as the model for citizens.[237]

From the 340s on, the wording of honorific decrees reflects the use of honors to promote actions beneficial to the polis' administration and finances. We have already seen this characteristic feature in the decree for Pytheas of Alopece; he is honored "in order that others who are elected in charge of the water supply may each of them also show love of honor (*philotimôntai*) toward the people."[238] Clauses like this, called "hortatory clauses," may have served to justify awarding honors to citizens, something that never ceased to be problematic and that in the 340s was incorporating the novelty – and high distinction – of inscribing the decree.[239] But such

[234] Brun 1983: 170–2.
[235] The date of the introduction of the *theôrika* is controversial. Cf. Leppin 1995: 558.
[236] Leppin 1995: 567.
[237] X. *Vect.* 3. 3–4 (tr. Marchant). Cf. Gauthier 1976: 84; Engen 2010: 60, 172–3; Lambert 2011a: 196–7.
[238] *IG* II³ 338 (tr. Lambert *AIO*).
[239] On the hortatory clause: Luraghi 2010: 250–1; Lambert 2011a: 194–8 (cf. 196 on its justificative aspect).

clauses can also be found in honorific decrees for foreigners, for which, from this point of view, no justification was necessary; the exhortative intention is clear. In addition to hortatory clauses, a new vocabulary absent from earlier decrees is used and had the same intention of encouraging benefactions.[240] The key word here is *philotimia* ("love of honor"). Pytheas has behaved *philotimôs*, and his honors are supposed to stimulate the *philotimia* of other citizens. The decree in honor of another benefactor mentioned earlier says the same. Phanodemus of Thymaetadae "legislated well and with love of honor (*philotimôs*)" and is praised for his *philotimia*.[241] In the 340s, the term *philotimia* was not new, but its use in polis decrees was. Moreover, as Whitehead has demonstrated, the term was employed with a connotation not found in the archaic period or the fifth century.[242] Originally, *philotimia* was an ambivalent term that referred to a "selfish" love of honor; Lambert defines it as an "aristocratic/elitist/contention-encouraging virtue."[243] In the fourth-century decrees, by contrast, it implies not only "love of honor" but also "love of a particular type of honor," that which derives from doing good to the community. To invite citizens to act *philotimôs* means to encourage them to be benefactors of the polis. That we find no decrees with this message before the 340s, however, should not lead to the conclusion that this meaning of *philotimia* is a product of the more systematic use of honors after the Social War (357–355 BC). *Philotimia* appears with the same meaning already in *Against Leptines* (355 BC) and in decrees passed by the demes before the Social War.[244] In the 340s, the word had already undergone a semantic change as a consequence of the development of euergetism in the first half of the century.

Not only the text, however, but also the stele on which it was inscribed had an exhortative function. Indeed, the stele was probably even more important than the inscribed text. The text had its greatest impact before it was inscribed, when it was read in front of the demos in the assembly, but one wonders how many Athenians went to the acropolis – where most honorific inscriptions were displayed – and read them, or how many actually *could* read them. (The potential benefactors did, of course, but

[240] See the discussion of this vocabulary in Engen 2010: 119–35.
[241] *IG* II^3 348 (tr. Lambert *AIO*).
[242] The earliest reference to *philotimia* in a decree is *IG* II^3 306 (343/2 BC). On the evolution of the use of the word, see Whitehead 1983.
[243] Lambert 2011b: 177.
[244] D. 20. 103 and 155; *SEG* XLII 112 = RO 46 (*ca*. 360). Whitehead 1986: 243–4, 380–1 accepts this date but believes that the earliest examples of *philotimia* from the demes are "closely contemporaneous with those from the city itself." Cf. Rhodes and Osborne 2003: 232–3.

the hortatory power of the text was based on its capacity to persuade not only this group but also others who could exercise social pressure.) The physical presence of the inscription – even its mere existence and the fact that people who did not see it knew about it – had an exhortative effect. It was enough to see a honorific stele to be reminded – sometimes with the help of the reliefs – of the rewards of acting *philotimôs*; to look at the acropolis from the distance knowing that it was full of such inscriptions, produced similar sensations.[245]

The practice of regularly inscribing honorific decrees for citizens in the second half of the fourth century is related to the fact that the inscription itself was a reward (one foreigners had been receiving for a long time), and to the conscious decision to increase honors for citizens. But it also has to do with the reinforcement of the hortatory dimension of euergetism in this period. Admittedly, euergetism had always had this dimension. In the archaic age, the *proxenia* was awarded to encourage benefactions not only from the recipients but also from other foreigners, and in fifth-century Athens, bestowing crowns on generals was not only a concession but also a way to motivate them in the tradition of awards for valor (*aristeia*). Demosthenes in *Against Leptines* is very much aware of the hortatory side of euergetism. He envisions a scenario, for instance, in which "from ambition for the rewards (*dôreiai*) of good service (*euergesiai*) all chose the path of duty" and opposes "abolishing the rewards of good service and so rendering fruitless the good intentions of those who are ambitious for honor."[246] In the years after the composition of this speech (355 BC), however, the hortatory aspect acquires a dimension not seen earlier.

In line with the complexity of the measures previously mentioned (*merismos, stratiôtika, symmoriai*), legislation was developed to regulate when, how, and where to award honors. The dispute about Demosthenes' crown offers hints regarding this legislation, which was nonetheless susceptible to conflicting interpretations. According to a law quoted by Aeschines, the crowns awarded by the demos had to be proclaimed in the assembly, whereas Demosthenes maintains that they could be proclaimed in the theater. We also learn from the debate that it was illegal to propose a crown for an official who had not passed his scrutiny (*euthyna*) before the board of auditors at the end of his term (at least in the case of crowns rewarding the whole term of office rather than concrete benefactions).[247]

[245] On the hortatory power of inscribed decrees, see Lambert 2011a: 200–201. On reliefs, see Lawton 1995.
[246] D. 20. 154–5 (tr. Vince).
[247] Aeschin. 3. 11–12, 31–2, 43–5; D. 18. 120–1. On this question, see Section 3.3.

In conclusion, granting honors to financial contributors and good administrators was more than a reaction to the growing number of civic benefactors. Behind those honors was the idea of improving the polis through euergetism, as well as through rules intended to help the demos do so in an organized way. It is in this sense that we can speak of the existence of an *euergetic system*.

3.2 Embedded features

In a previous chapter, I concluded that one characteristic of the demos in the classical period – at least from the mid-fifth century on – was its determination to avoid any political subordination to the elite that might be reminiscent of the clientelism of the past.[248] Gifts by the elite entailed risks in this regard. Although the demos continued to control the Athenian political system, the fact that certain citizens were able to obtain political support in return for gifts showed that gifts were dangerous or, to be more precise, that they were especially dangerous if reciprocated with informal counter-gifts. The awarding of honors as formal counter-gifts thus may reflect not only a financial strategy but also a concern to escape subordination via riskier forms of reciprocation. The prestige associated with honors could still be used for political purposes, but this source of power did not have the same demeaning connotations as subordination through indebtment by gifts (although, as I explain at the end of this chapter, honors turned out to be dangerous in a different way).

Since the beginning of euergetism, Athens had tried to prevent the emergence of an officially distinct class of citizens publicly recognized as *euergetai*. But in its most democratic period (the fourth century), the city was impelled to promote inequality in the form of euergetic honors among its citizens. It nonetheless tried to remain loyal to its principles. The extension of honors to performance in office other than financial benefactions must be understood not only as intended to improve the administration and government of the polis but also as a means to reduce the impact of awarding *euergetês* status to members of the elite.

At the same time, the existence of an organized system of official rewards demonstrated that although the polis now accepted new forms of benefaction, it did so without ceding the initiative to the elite, and by setting the rules of euergetism. This can be observed above all else in honorific decrees that in addition to emphasizing the virtues and accomplishments of the

[248] See Chapter 4, Section 1.2.

benefactors highlight the demos and its power to make decisions, leaving no doubt that the democracy controlled euergetism. Indeed, the demos and its power are so prominent in honorific decrees that it is evident that rewarding benefactors functioned as a way to reaffirm democracy, and inscribing such decrees on stone as a way to advertise it. All the decrees passed by the Athenian demos contributed to this. But honorific decrees played a particularly important role, since most decrees passed by the demos – as well as the majority of decrees eventually transferred to stone – were in honor of *euergetai*.

Another dimension of honors also transcended the function of rewarding and brings us back to aspects of euergetic honors already discussed in relation to the origins of the institution. In the political scene, demagogues competed in a kind of political agon; Demosthenes himself compares them to contenders trying to win a prize in an athletic contest.[249] Success in this competition was measured by the number of proposals a man had accepted by the assembly, by political appointments via election, and by awarded honors.[250] If in the origins of euergetism certain prizes functioned as rewards for benefactions,[251] certain rewards now functioned as prizes. This fourth-century tendency became one of the main features of Hellenistic euergetism, in which members of the elite competed eagerly for honors.

3.3 Euergetic honors

Honors for financial gifts were common enough in 354 BC for Isocrates to be able to write in regard to several of his disciples: "All these men were crowned by Athens with chaplets of gold, not because they were covetous of other people's possessions, but because they were honorable men and had spent large sums of their private fortunes upon the city."[252] In 357/6 BC, eight trierarchs dedicated the crowns that were bestowed on them by the demos and the boule for their services during an expedition to the Hellespont. (Unfortunately, we do not know the exact nature of these services.[253]) We have seen that in 330 BC, Demosthenes mentions, as precedents for the crown Ctesiphon proposed conferring on him in 337 BC, the crowning of Nausicles (several times), Diotimus, Charidemus, and Neoptolemus. Like Demosthenes, all these men were rewarded for pecuniary generosity.[254] But the Athenians also rewarded

[249] D. 18. 319–20. [250] Mann 2007: 29. [251] Chapter 4, Section 2.3.
[252] Isoc. 15. 94 (tr. Norlin). Cf. Too 2008: 141–2. [253] *IG* II² 1953. See Gabrielsen 1994: 83.
[254] D. 18. 114. See also *IG* II² 1496.

officials for accomplishments that were not financial contributions. As in the case of honors for military achievements, one of the first measures was to award prizes. Since at least 408/7 BC there had been a contest for the best prytany of the year, a practice we know from dedications by the prytaneis and that is well documented for the first half of the fourth century.[255] The prize was normally given by the demos (sometimes by the council) and went to the prytany that had best served the interests of the polis.[256] A crown and public praise were also bestowed on the best councilor, although in this case the earliest evidence is from 343/2 BC, from the dedication reproducing the council decree that conferred the award. The first lines of the inscription present the award as the prize in a competition. The criteria and the procedure to decide the winner are explained: the council "resolved to make a judgment of those speaking in the council in the ninth prytany and to honor the man who seemed to it to have spoken and acted best and incorruptibly on behalf of the Athenian council and people throughout the year, and . . . voted about this and chose Phanodemus son of Diyllus of Thymaetadae." In the following lines, however, the language becomes that characteristic of an honorific decree, and Phanodemus is depicted as an archetypal benefactor: the council decides to honor him "for his excellence and justice towards the Athenian council and people" and because he "has held office as councilor well and with love of honour (*philotimôs*)," and it commissions inscription of the decree "in order that [everyone else *or* all other officials] may also be aware that the people and council know how *to give thanks* to those who speak and act excellently on behalf of the council and the people." The prize becomes a reward for a benefactor, a counter-gift the council gives to encourage emulation but also to show that it fulfills its obligation to reciprocate.[257]

At the time of Demosthenes' *Against Androtion* (357–354 BC), it was already customary to grant a crown to the entire boule for successful management after its year of office or even before the end of the year.[258] The speech makes clear that the boule was entitled to ask for a crown only if

[255] Cf. *Agora* XV 1–25.

[256] Meritt and Traill 1974: 2, who following Dow 1937: 2, assume that these awards go back to the time of Cleisthenes but provide no proof of this. The first evidence is from 408/7 BC (*Agora* XV 1); for most of the second half of the fourth century, the evidence comes from dedications, and not until 307/6 BC is the practice of inscribing the decrees honoring the *prytaneis* documented. *IG* II^3 417 (from *ca*. 340 BC to 325 BC), however, constitutes an interesting precedent.

[257] *IG* II^3 306 (tr. Lambert *AIO*).

[258] D. 22. 5, 8, 36–7; see Gauthier 1985: 113–14; Faraguna 1992: 338; cf. Rhodes 1985a: 15–16. *IG* II^2 2790 reports the crowning of the boule of 357/6 BC for its year of office; cf. Rhodes 1985a: 133. See also Aeschin. 1. 112.

it had fulfilled certain requirements ("the law explicitly denies to the council the right to request a reward, if they have not built the warships").[259] Hyperides' speech *Against Philippides* (338/6 BC) deals with the award of crowns to a board of *proedroi* (the rotating chairmen of the council and the assembly).[260] Individual officials as well might be rewarded for a single achievement – for example, successfully organizing a festival or carrying out certain sacrifices[261] – or for their overall performance during a term in office.[262] Sometime before 340 BC (probably around the middle of the fourth century), a law was passed that prohibited honors for individuals who had not given a public account of their activity in office at the end of their term.[263] It is uncertain whether this law forbade *any* honors to officials subject to audit or only honors for the term in office, making it permissible to distinguish an official for a single official achievement before he passed his audit.[264] The first scenario seems more plausible; at a time when the exchange of honors for donations had become part of the financial system and efforts were being made to regulate this exchange in a sensible way, officials are unlikely to have been honored for donations made during their time in office, if the audit might still reveal that they had taken more from the public funds than they had donated. In addition, as Aeschines points out, the fact that a man had been honored during his term of office could influence jurors at the auditor's court. Although it was possible to try to get around the law by including the clause that the honors – normally a crown – would not be conferred until after the audit ("the people/the council shall decide to crown him when he has rendered his account"),[265] judging the account of an officer who had received only provisional honors was different from judging that of an individual who had already been crowned.

In fact, this clause, if understood in the context of the efforts the Athenians made to improve their finances and administration, does not seem to be a simple legal trick. The granting of provisional honors to an official almost ensured that he would try to perform as well as possible, because, in addition to feeling gratitude for the recognition, he would be unlikely to want to lose his distinction. This function of provisional honors

[259] D. 22. 8 (tr. Murray). Cf. [Arist.] *Ath.* 46. 1. [260] Hyp. 2. 4–6. [261] Gauthier 1985: 116–17.
[262] See the examples in Harris 1994: 147.
[263] Aeschin. 3. 11–12, 31. On the date of the law, Gauthier 1985: 116.
[264] Most scholars who deal with Aeschin. 3 and D. 18 lean toward the first option but pay little attention to the legal arguments. (Gwatkin 1957 is an exception.) Harris, who has analyzed the speeches in detail, arrives at the opposite conclusion (Harris 1994: 144–8; Harris 2000: 60–7).
[265] Aeschin. 3. 10–12 criticizes this practice, which is epigraphically attested: *IG* II^3 306; 327, 29–46; 359; *IG* II^3 360 = *Agora* XV 49.

is clear when they were awarded not for a concrete accomplishment during the term in office but for performance during the entire term before it was over.[266] In such cases, the honors were close to the category of proleptic honors discussed in Chapter 1, which rewarded – non-provisionally – benefactions in anticipation of their completion.

The most common honors for citizens were crowns and public praise. This is partly because the set of possible honors for citizens was more limited than it was for foreigners – *politeia, enktêsis, proxenia*, and the like were obviously out of the question[267] – but also because the introduction of honors for citizens was originally linked to the crowns and praise associated with awards for valor and prizes for liturgists.[268] Even when crowns and praise became established euergetic rewards, in fact, the Athenians did not stop seeing honored citizens as champions who in the competition for honor (*timê*) had achieved a distinction beyond that of others. This perception allows Aeschines to criticize Demosthenes' crown by drawing a connection between athletic crowns and crowns awarded for political services: "Do you think, fellow citizens, that any man would ever have been willing to train for the pancratium or any other of the harder contests in the Olympic games, or any of the other games that confer a crown, if the crown were given, not to the best man, but to the man who had successfully intrigued for it?"[269]

But this link between rewards for citizens and those for athletic contests was not as close as it might have been. For most of the fourth century, neither *sitêsis* and *proedria* (which in Athens were awarded to athletes) nor the statue (which in other poleis was also awarded to athletes) was conferred for nonathletic benefactions on citizens other than successful generals.[270] Demosthenes in 355 BC notes how extraordinary these honors (the *megistai timai*) were, while Aeschines in 343 BC observes that they were

[266] See the examples in Harris 1994: 147. On the possibility of decreeing "provisional honors" at any time, see also Rhodes 1985a: 237.

[267] So too the title *euergetês*, but for more complex reasons: to prevent the emergence of a formal class of *euergetai* within the community.

[268] See Chapter 4, Section 2.3.

[269] Aeschin. 3. 179–80. He continues: "Imagine, therefore, that you yourselves are the officials presiding over a contest in political virtue, and consider this, that if you give the prizes to few men and worthy, and in obedience to the laws, you will find many men to compete in virtue's struggle." On these passages and the relationship between rhetoric and agon, see Hawhee 2004; 30–3; Roisman 2007: 400–405. See also Demosthenes' analogy with athletic crowns in his argument opposing the elimination of *ateleia* for benefactors (D. 20. 141).

[270] See Chapter 3, Sections 2–3 (on *sitêsis, proedria*, and statues for athletes in Athens and other poleis), and this chapter, Section 2.1 (on those honors for military commanders in Athens). Individuals who enjoyed *sitêsis* not as a reward for benefactions but *ex officio* are irrelevant to this discussion; see M. Osborne 1981.

granted to victorious generals but not to citizens for political and diplomatic accomplishments: "You set up your statues and you give your seats of honor and your crowns and your dinners in the prytaneum, not to those who have brought you tidings of peace, but to those who have been victorious in battle."[271] Not until 335 BC do we know of a citizen being distinguished with *sitêsis* and a bronze statue in the agora for political achievements: Demades, who in the critical period after the destruction of Thebes convinced Alexander to abandon his demand that Athens surrender several famous orators.[272]

Despite criticisms aroused by this unprecedented set of rewards (vehemently opposed by Lycurgus and Polyeuctus),[273] shortly afterward we again find *megistai timai* rewarding citizens for nonmilitary services. According to Dinarchus, Demosthenes proposed granting *sitêsis* and a statue to a certain Diphilus, whom Demosthenes may also have suggested rewarding for his performance as *syntrierarchos* sometime between 334 BC and 324 BC.[274] In the same period, Neoptolemus was honored with a statue at the proposal of Lycurgus for gilding the altar of Apollo.[275] According to the lexicographer Harpocration, Lycurgus said in his speech *On Administration* that someone named Epicrates was honored with a bronze statue because of his law regarding the *ephebia*. The identity of this man – to whom a fortune of 600 talents is attributed – is uncertain, as is the precise date of the law, though it probably belongs to the Lycurgan period, 336/5 BC being the most likely date.[276] All these honors might have been connected with new legislation thought to have been introduced by Lycurgus between 334 BC and 330 BC that opened up the possibility of recompensing citizens with *sitêsis, proedria*, and statues for nonmilitary benefactions.[277] But even if that legislation existed – we do not in fact need the hypothesis to explain a phenomenon that fits well in the general trend – it had little impact, since the *megistai timai* remained quite exclusive honors for the rest of the fourth century.[278]

[271] D. 20. 120–4; Aeschin. 2. 80 (tr. Adams).
[272] On the rewards, see Din. 1. 101. On Demades' performance, see Worthington 1992: 252, 271; Kralli 1999–2000: 147–8; Brun 2000.
[273] Lycurg. fr. 9 Conomis = 14 Burtt = 8 Durrbach; Apsines 10. 6 (198 Dilts–Kennedy). M. Osborne 1981: 165–6; Gauthier 1985: 109–10.
[274] On the rewards, see Din. 1. 43. On Diphilus and the date of his benefaction, see Worthington 1992: 200–203.
[275] Plu. *Mor.* 843f–4a; Hakkarainen 1997: 9, 28.
[276] Harp. s. v. "Epikrates." Reinmuth 1971: 124 is skeptical. See, however, Habicht 1997: 16; Burckhardt 1996: 31 (adding art historical arguments); Humphreys 2004: 82–3 (with doubts, nonetheless, about the identity of Epicrates of Pallene).
[277] M. Osborne 1981: 164–70; cf. Kralli 1999–2000: 134 n. 4, 141–8.
[278] M. Osborne 1981: 159; Gauthier 1985: 112; Hakkarainen 1997: 27–8.

There are instances of posthumous *megistai timai* for nonmilitary benefactions. That they were granted to deceased benefactors, however, did not prevent some of them from being controversial. Eubulus, the great administrator of the *theôrikon*, was bestowed honors (*dôreai*) that seem to have included *megistai timai* and were opposed in 331/0 BC by Hyperides in a speech that has been lost.[279] Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides obtained statues in the theater of Dionysus.[280] They were treated as civic benefactors,[281] but the orator Philinus challenged the statues of Sophocles and Euripides. As has been suggested, the fact that Philinus did not criticize Aeschylus' statue in the same way might be related to Aeschylus' role at Marathon.[282] Socrates was honored with a statue at the Pompeium that most scholars assign to the Lycurgan period, but it has also been dated to the time of Demetrius of Phaleron.[283]

According to our sources, the tragedian Astydamas received a statue in the theater of Dionysus in his lifetime, around 340 BC.[284] This award was allegedly surrounded by controversy as well, since the Athenians supposedly rejected the epigram that Astydamas himself composed for the statue base. But such a great honor for Astydamas in commemoration of his victory with *Parthenopaeus* in 340 BC is surprising. As John Ma points out, the sources are highly problematic and it is possible that Astydamas' statue dates after the statues of the three tragedians.[285]

Another reward for citizens, more common than the *megistai timai* but less widespread than the crown and public praise, was exemption (*ateleia*) from festival liturgies. This reward, however, did not fit well with the fourth-century policy of using euergetic honors to increase the resources of the polis. Consequently, in 356/5 BC the Athenians passed a law proposed by Leptines to abolish it.[286] Enough citizens might have received (or have been expected to receive) *ateleia* for it to be considered harmful to the interests of the polis; more likely, the honor was simply perceived as contradictory at a time when donations had become more relevant for the economy of the polis.[287]

[279] Hyp. frr. 104–6 Jensen; cf. Gauthier 1985: 106; Lambert 2012a: 8.
[280] Plu. *Mor.* 841f; Paus. 1. 21. 1–2. [281] Hanink 2014: 77, 81
[282] Hanink 2014: 78. Aeschylus may have been depicted in the Stoa Poikile (Paus.1. 21. 2)
[283] D.L. 2. 43. On the date of Socrates' statue, see Zanker 1995: 57–62 and Dillon 2006: 104. For the later date, see P. Moreno 1987: 192–8.
[284] D.L. 2. 43; Astydamas II *TrGF* 60 T 2a and b. [285] Ma 2013: 110. Cf. Hanink 2014: 183–8.
[286] We know some details of this law thanks to Demosthenes' *Against Leptines*. Whether it resisted the attacks by Demosthenes is unclear; see Christ 2006: 152 n. 22.
[287] Demosthenes' (20. 21) claim that only a few citizens had been granted *ateleia* is an exaggeration aimed at contesting Leptines' law.

Finally, we should not forget the inscription reproducing the honorific decree on a stele and the fact that this was not only a record of the honors awarded but also an honor in and of itself. The high regard for this distinction is shown by the resistance – in line with the reluctance to honor citizens – to integrating it into civic euergetism; for decades, foreigners were rewarded with inscriptions while citizens were not (or only exceptionally), despite receiving other honors. Dedications recording awards, common in the first half of the fourth century, mark the transition to the custom of inscribing decrees in honor of citizens. Once this became regular practice in the 340s, the polis took care of commissioning the stele and paying for the expenses. In the case of Phanodemus, for example, the council decides – following the standard formula – that "the prytany secretary shall inscribe this decree on a stone stele and stand it in the sanctuary of Amphiaraus," and that "for inscribing the stele the treasurer of the people shall give 20 drachmas from the people's fund for expenditure on decrees."[288] The inscription, however, was not only a reward because it was paid for by the polis. Before the middle of the fourth century, this was already a great honor, although the honorands – foreigners – normally covered the expense.[289] There were many reasons why the inscription was seen as a reward. It was a privilege: not every honorific decree was inscribed, and the inscription had to be approved by the assembly or the council. The inscription was also a monument, which often consisted not only of the stele itself but also of decoration depicting the honorand, erected in a public place to commemorate his actions. The inscribed stele projected the honors onto space and time; the stone drew attention from a distance, and the engraved text spoke about the honors to posterity. It not only informed the reader about the honors, but to the extent that it reproduced the original decree, it also reenacted again and again the ritual of bestowing them. The solidity of the material on which the decree was replicated, together with the effort required to engrave it on a hard surface, expressed the determination with which the polis rewarded the benefactor and the force of the honorific intent. The erection of the stele in a sacred place added to the enduring power of the supporting material the guarantee of divine protection.

The inscribed stele was surrounded by other stelae, making it apparent that the honorand was a member of a group, the exclusive club of benefactors of the polis. The Athenians, however, did not go so far as to inscribe their honored citizens in a list of *euergetai*; that is, they never gave

[288] *IG* II³ 348 (tr. Lambert, *AIO*). [289] Cf. Engen 2010: 176–7.

them the *euergesia* (the *euergetês* title) so often awarded to foreigners. Above all, Athens did not want to institutionalize such a group; the granting of honors to citizens was enough of a challenge to the egalitarian ethos of the polis. But it was also important that the *euergesia* was traditionally closely connected to foreigners and frequently awarded together with the *proxenia*, an honor out of place for citizens.[290] The *euergesia* was reminiscent of foreigners. Moreover, the word *euergetês*, though it evoked in principle only the unidirectional act of doing good to the polis, when used as a title implied a bidirectional relationship: both the benefaction to the polis and the privileges conferred by the polis on the benefactor. In this sense, to be an *euergetês* meant to be a foreigner with a special status, which made the title as inappropriate for citizens as *proxenos* was. This is why not even in the Hellenistic poleis – which presumably were less concerned about the emergence of an "order" of *euergetai* – was *euergesia* awarded to citizens.[291] On the other hand, this does not mean that in classical Athens citizens were never called *euergetai*. But to say that a citizen was an *euergetês* or had behaved as such was not the same as awarding him the title *euergetês*. Gauthier has studied this question, and the confusion between being called *euergetês* and receiving the *euergetês* title is one of his main criticisms of Paul Veyne.[292]

Euergetic honors were awarded not only by the polis but also by its subdivisions, such as demes, *phylai*, and *phratriai*. The most frequent reward was a gold crown, but there were others such as foliage crowns, *proedria*, and praise. Most examples are from demes, and within these, rewards for fellow demesmen predominate over those for outsiders (although the latter often reside within the deme).[293] While deme honors are sometimes granted for service to the polis, most recompense service to the deme itself.

Although honors granted by demes began as imitations of those given by the polis to foreigners and citizens,[294] the epigraphic evidence for them starts quite early. At the beginning of the fourth century, a list honoring

[290] See Chapter 3, Section 1.1, where most examples are from the fifth century. In the second half of the fourth century, the *euergesia* is routinely awarded with *proxenia*: for example, *IG* II^3 294; 317; 322; 324; 342; 343; 344; 347; 367; 379; 383; 390; 392; 398; 403; 405; 406; 432; 434; 435; 468; 474; 475; 478; 479; 492; 493; 516. Only occasionally does it appear separated: for example, in the decree in honor of Eudemus of Plataia (IG II^3 352).

[291] The few known cases of the award of the title *euergetês* to citizens are from "marginal" places (Istrus, Lissa, Amyzon, and Hanisa) in the Hellenistic age (Gauthier 1985: 33–9) and must be understood as exceptions to the rule.

[292] Gauthier 1985: 7–10, 16–24.

[293] Whitehead 1986: 41, 72 n. 27, 238, 249; Jones 1999: 118–19.

[294] Jones 1999: 9.

financial contributors was inscribed at Athmonon.[295] Around 360 BC, Halae Aexonides crowned twenty-four demesmen for having erected a statue of Aphrodite and awarded honors to the priest of Apollo Zoster and his four assistants.[296] Before the mid-fourth century, Icarion distinguished a demarch and two *chorêgoi*,[297] while an unidentified deme (perhaps Acharnae) may have honored a demarch and some *chorêgoi*.[298] In the middle of the fourth century, Halae Araphenides granted honors to a deme liturgist, Icarion to a demarch, Myrrhinous to a deme financial officer, Teithras to a certain Euthippus for expenditure on a statue, and an unidentified deme to a certain Charinus.[299]

Epigraphic evidence for honors granted by *phylai* goes back to shortly after 403/2 BC (by Pandionis);[300] several belong to the early fourth century (e.g., by Pandionis in 386/5 BC, by Cecropis in 376/5 BC, by the same two *phylai* at an unspecified date near the beginning of the fourth century, and by an unknown *phylê* to an entire board of *prytaneis*);[301] others predate the mid-fourth century (by Cecropis [probably], Erechtheis, Leontis. Pandionis, Hippothontis, and Acamantis).[302] Sometime between the early and the mid-fourth century, meanwhile, an unnamed phratry decides "to praise [Eugeiton son of Euc]les of Phalerum [and crown him with a] gold [crown worth . . . drachma]s [because of] his goodness [and justice towards the phrateres]."[303]

In the second half of the fourth century, the evidence for honors bestowed by subgroups increases significantly. The large amount of information is evidently related to the fact that among demes, *phylai, phratriai*, and other bodies, numerous entities were now able to bestow honors. But other factors should also be considered. One is changes in the epigraphic habit: while Athens' custom of inscribing decrees in honor of citizens seems to have some of its roots in an earlier development of this

[295] *SEG* XXIV 197. Whitehead 1986: 376. But none of the fifth-century deme inscriptions known to us is an honorary decree or refers to honors (*IG* I³ 242; 243 fr. 10; 244; 245; 248; 250; 251; 253; 254; 256; 258; *SEG* XII 52).

[296] *IG* II² 2820; Peek 1942: 9–10, no. 7; Whitehead 1986: 239, 380–1.

[297] *IG* II² 1178. Whitehead 1986: 382.

[298] *IG* II² 1173. Whitehead 1986: 391.

[299] Whitehead 1986: 381 (Halae Araphenides); *IG* II² 1179. Whitehead 1986: 382 (Icarion); *IG* II² 1182. Whitehead 1986: 384 (Myrrhinous); *SEG* XXIV 153. Whitehead 1986: 390 (Teithras); *IG* II² 2829. Whitehead 1986: 391 (unidentified deme).

[300] *IG* II² 1138.

[301] *IG* II² 1140 (Pandionis); 1141 (Cecropis); 1144 (Pandionis); 1143 (Cecropis). *IG* II² 1142; Jones 1999: 167 n. 39, 185 (unknown *phylê*).

[302] *IG* II² 1145 (Cecropis?); *IG* II² 1146; 1147; 1150; Meritt 1963: 41 no. 42 (Erechtheis); *IG* II² 2818. Jones 1999: 186 (Leontis); *IG* II² 1148 (Pandionis); *IG* II² 1149. Jones 1999: 163–4, 185 (Hippothontis); *IG* II² 1151 (Aeantis); Dow 1976: 81–4 (Acamantis); *IG* II² 1149 may be from as early as *ca.* 400 BC: cf Tracy (forthcoming).

[303] Hedrick 1988: 113 (*SEG* XXXVIII 128); tr. Lambert 1993: 335 (slightly adapted).

practice in the subdivisions of the polis, the expansion of the custom in the second half of the fourth century in turn must have impacted demes, *phylai*, and *phratriai*. Another factor might be the possibility (mentioned earlier) that in the fourth century, the demes (from which most of our information comes) assumed responsibility for functions formerly carried out by the polis.[304] Moreover, granting honors to citizens may have been easier in the subdivisions of the polis – particularly the demes – than in the boule and the assembly. The ties between elite and demos were stronger at the deme level than at the polis level. For a member of the elite, it must have been much easier to obtain honors from fellow demesmen, with whom he interacted regularly and among whom he probably had many "clients" than from the members of other demes in the assembly of citizens.[305] According to Robin Osborne, the majority of honored benefactors clearly belonged to the deme-elite, while the proposers of decrees were less wealthy, and the people in charge of inscribing them and setting up the stelae – the demarchs – even less so.[306] Finally, there were services to the polis that the city did not consider benefactions but certain subgroups did. Choregic victories at city festivals, for example, were often rewarded with euergetic honors by the *phylai* and the demes. Even the exercise of polis offices – including serving as *bouleutês* – might entitle a man to euergetic honors for having benefited his particular subgroup.[307]

Some deme benefactors were extremely rich: Neoptolemus, for example, who in addition to restoring the temple of Artemis Aristoboule in his deme, made major contributions to the polis and is described by Demosthenes as "very rich."[308] Phidippus son of Apemon, the honored *chorêgos* Philoxenides of Aexone, and Democrates, another honored *chorêgos* of the same deme, were also wealthy. But as Osborne reminds us, there were also honorands of a more modest social background. Demarchs in particular often did not come from the wealthiest tier of the deme and were sometimes honored simply for taking care of the

[304] See Section 2.2, on "Gifts in Office and Other Private Donations."

[305] On the "men and families which, for all the real extent of democracy and egalitarianism in its formal organization, in fact dominated deme society," the *domini nobiles* of the deme, see Whitehead 1986: 240–1; also Jones 2004: 78–85. As Morris 2000: 139–44, observes, while we should be cautious about the role we assign to patron-client relationships, for which we have little evidence, "there were patron-client dyads in classical Athens, as there are in the modern Mediterranean countryside. Finley was surely right that Cimon was not the only Athenian who used his wealth to create a following."

[306] R. Osborne 1985: 75, 87.

[307] See Jones 1999: 188–90; Whitehead 1986: 234–5.

[308] D. 21. 215.

inscription of the decree and the stele.[309] The process by which euergetic honors were diffused thus reveals a democratization of the act. It was not only citizens wealthy enough to become generals, perform polis liturgies, or make great gifts to the community who could obtain some kind of distinction but also those whose expenditures had an impact at the deme level or who performed well in polis or deme offices that did not require private expenditure.

3.4 Deipnon (*and* xenia) *in the prytaneion*

I have already referred to the honor of a permanent right to entertainment (*sitêsis*) in the prytaneion. But Athens also awarded this entertainment on a single occasion. Although this honor was not as great as *sitêsis*, it deserves special attention because of the scholarly controversy that has arisen regarding it and the fact that the discussion reinforces some of the interpretations advanced regarding the origins of euergetism and the role of euergetic honors.

The sources – most of them inscriptions – distinguish between invitations to *xenia* and invitations to *deipnon*. As a rule, the first formula is used when the guest is a foreigner, the second when he is a citizen.[310] For example: "(it was resolved) to invite the ambassadors from Amyntas to *xenia* and those sent by the demos to *deipnon* in the prytaneion on the next day."[311] When the beneficiary is a foreigner who is also granted citizenship, however, the term is *deipnon*, even though in most cases the dinner would have taken place before the citizenship had been made effective.[312] The decree that grants citizenship to Archippus of Thasos, for example, undertakes to "invite Archippus to *deipnon* in the prytaneion on the next day."[313] Finally, there are examples of individuals invited to *deipnon* who seem to be foreigners who have not received citizenship, as well as of citizens invited to *xenia*. Most of these apparently contradictory cases can be explained as simple errors, or as cases in which the beneficiaries have received citizenship rights for which there is no evidence or are foreigners perceived as practically being citizens.[314]

[309] On all these wealthy benefactors, see R. Osborne 1985: 86–7. On the more modest ones, Osborne 1985: 75, 87.
[310] See the collection of sources in Miller 1978: 132–218. Additions in M. Osborne 1981: 154 n. 4.
[311] *IG* II^2 102 (Miller 1978: no. 86). See also *IG* II^2 107 (Miller 1978: no. 88); 124 (Miller 1978: no. 95); 127 (Miller 1978: no. 96).
[312] The invitation to *deipnon* was normally for the day after the decree was issued. Nor did all foreigners agree to become citizens. See M. Osborne 1981: 154.
[313] *IG* II^3 333 (Miller 1978: no. 137). See also *IG* II^2 17 (Miller 1978: no. 65) and 19 (Miller 1978: no. 66).
[314] See Miller 1978: 5–6; M. Osborne 1981; Henry 1983: 271–5; Rhodes 1984.

Beyond the fact that *xenia* was offered to foreigners and *deipnon* to citizens (occasionally quasi-citizens), were there other differences between these honors? This question has sparked more controversy. Some scholars see divergences of both rank and content. According to Stephen Miller, "Deipnon would appear to have been the 'higher' honor, either because of a better menu, or because of some religious ceremony closed to non-citizens."[315] Peter Rhodes, on the other hand, has pointed out that some foreigners might have felt aggrieved if they were not entertained as well as citizens; in addition, foreigners who were given rights and privileges that made them in some ways equal to citizens were invited to *xenia* and not *deipnon*. Rhodes accordingly suggests that *xenia* and *deipnon* may have referred to the same entertainment.[316] This hypothesis would help explain some of the errors in the inscriptions. It is also reinforced by research of a more literary nature by Pauline Schmitt Pantel and Philippe Spitzer, whose work corroborates the hypothesis that both *xenia* and *deipnon* consisted of a meal preceded by sacrifice. The term *xenia* emphasized the sacrificial part, which served to link foreigners to citizens and enable them to share a common dinner, whereas the term *deipnon* (meal) focused on the banquet that followed. But any sacrifice implied by the term *xenia* was followed by a *deipnon*, and any *deipnon* was preceded by a sacrifice like the one of the *xenia*.[317]

If the two terms are in this sense identical, why were both employed? Part of this question has already been answered: there were two categories of beneficiaries, foreigners and citizens. But this explanation is obviously insufficient; although *xenia* could not be used in relation to citizens, *deipnon* could have served for both citizens and foreigners. One might argue, therefore, that the distinction expressed the fact that the two groups had different relationships to the entertainment, as Schmitt Pantel believes: *xenia* "specifies that it is in the legal and institutional framework of the hospitality that the foreigner will have access to the sharing and consumption of the food . . . it indicates the invitation to participate in the *deipnon* of the citizens, the gesture par excellence of hospitality."[318] This is certainly true, but to understand the distinction we must also take into account its

[315] Miller 1978: 6. Similarly, M. Osborne 1981: 155; Henry 1983: 285 n. 50; Engen 2010: 169.
[316] Rhodes 1984: 196.
[317] Schmitt Pantel 1980, Schmitt Pantel 1992: 163–8; Spitzer 1994. Schmitt Pantel's work was unknown to Spitzer, just as Schmitt Pantel 1980 was unknown to Rhodes when he wrote Rhodes 1984, and Spitzer's work (initiated in 1989) was unknown to Schmitt Pantel). But all three arrived at similar conclusions working independently.
[318] Schmitt Pantel 1992: 165 (my translation; original in French). See also Spitzer 1994.

function, by exploring its possible origins: the process that led in the fourth century to honoring both foreigners and citizens with entertainment in the prytaneion.

My own opinion is that in the beginning there were probably hospitality gifts (*xenia*) with which the archaic polis welcomed envoys from other communities (*xenia* that included a hospitality meal). This would have led to the custom of inviting ambassadors to dinner in the prytaneion; as Lynette Mitchell observes, this dinner and what it involved constituted the *xenia* (hospitality gifts) the city provided.[319] With the emergence of the institution of euergetism, the invitation was included among the rewards for foreign benefactors.[320] This incorporation was favored by the fact that one of the first euergetic honors was *proxenia*, an honor modeled on guest-friendship. As Herman notes, "what is the meal (*xenia*) to which the city invites its *proxenoi* if not an institutionalised version of the feasting which sealed guest-friendships?"[321] In fact, in the fifth and fourth centuries the vast majority of foreign benefactors rewarded with *xenia* – a category not to be confused with foreigners invited to *xenia* in their condition as ambassadors – obtain *proxenia* at the same time or are already *proxenoi*.[322] The next step would have occurred with the development of civic euergetism: rewarding Athenian ambassadors with a single dinner in the prytaneion, an honor that logically could not be called *xenia* and was therefore referred to as *deipnon*.[323] In this case, the step was presumably facilitated by two circumstances. The first is the practice of rewarding with entertainment in the prytaneion new citizens or foreigners who were granted citizenship along with the entertainment, and who therefore could not be invited to *xenia*.[324] Second, the fact that Athenian ambassadors often came home together with foreign ambassadors made it natural to invite them all to the same meal, one group with the term *xenia* and the other, because of their citizen status, with a different term. Finally, *deipnon* would have been offered also to citizens who were not ambassadors. An example is the

[319] L. Mitchell 1997: 184.

[320] E.g. *IG* II^2 17; 110; *IG* II^3 302; 333; 346; 418; 432.

[321] Herman 1987: 136.

[322] Examples are numerous: *IG* I^3 91; 107; 110; 163; 165; 167; 169, p952; *IG* II^2 6; 13b; 19b (cf. L. Mitchell 1997: 39–40); 22; 51; 53; 54; 69; 95; 132; 133; 182; 188; 193; *IG* II^3 294; 317; 432; 435; 437; 455; 492; 493; *I. Delos* 88. In *IG* II^3 375, however, the invitation is to *deipnon*.

[323] Rhodes 1984: 196 imagines the same transition: "the state began by inviting distinguished foreigners to dinner, with the title *xenia*; subsequently it wanted to invite Athenian citizens to dinner in certain circumstances; but Athenian citizens were part of the state, so the state could not invite them to *xenia*; accordingly they were invited to the same entertainment as the non-citizens but for them it was called *deipnon*."

[324] E.g. Eumachus in *IG* I^3 127. See also *IG* II^2 17; 19; 21; 40 and *IG* II^3 375. Cf. Rhodes 1984.

trierarchos Apollodorus, rewarded for some extraordinary services in 362/1 BC, as he explains in *Against Polycles*:

> I mortgaged my farm to Thrasylochus and Archeneüs, and having borrowed 30 minae from them and distributed the money among the crew, I put to sea, that no part of the people's orders might fail to be carried out, as far as it depended on me. And the people, hearing of this, gave me a vote of thanks, and invited me to dine in the prytaneion.[325]

The sources support this reconstruction. References to invitations to *xenia* predate those for invitations to *deipnon*. While the former are already well represented in the last third of the fifth century and the early fourth, the latter are still rare in this period.[326] The invitation to *xenia* (normally with *proxenia*) for foreign benefactors appears long before the *deipnon* for Athenian ambassadors.[327] The first invitations to *deipnon* in the epigraphic record, in fact, are not to Athenian ambassadors but to foreigners awarded citizenship.[328] On the other hand, the *deipnon* was exceptional for Athenian benefactors other than ambassadors. In the case of Apollodorus,[329] the beneficiary is actually someone who returns to the polis after having served abroad.

The fact that the invitation to *deipnon* was normally offered to Athenian ambassadors or to citizens who had rendered similar services indicates that the distinction between *xenia* and *deipnon*, although it reflects the different relation of citizens and noncitizen beneficiaries of the honor to the polis, ultimately contains a similar relationship with this honor: one group is integrated, while the other is reintegrated after an absence that might have affected the individual's loyalty to the polis.[330] The type and degree of integration pursued varies, depending on whether the invited person is

[325] [D.] 50. 13. (trans. Murray). On the date of the services, see Heskel 1997: 75–7.

[326] There are many examples of *xenia* in the final third of the fifth century and the first third of the fourth; from the final third of the fifth century alone, see, for example, *IG* I^3 11; 43; 63; 66; 85; 91; 101; 106; 107; 110; 118; 123; 149; 163; 165; 167; 169; 180; 182 bis; *IG* II^2 1; 2; 6; 13. *IG* I^3 85; 127; *IG* II^2 1 (end of the fifth century) and *IG* II^2 17; 19; 21; 70 (first third of the fourth century) are among the limited number of examples of *deipnon* in this period.

[327] There are several examples of *xenia* for foreign benefactors in the final third of the fifth century (e.g., *IG* I^3 91; 107; 165; 167; 182 bis; *IG* II^2 2; 6; 13), while we have to wait until the 370s for instances of *deipnon* for Athenian ambassadors (*IG* II^2 40; 70; *SEG* XXI 230).

[328] *IG* I^3 127; *IG* II^2 1; 17; 19; 21. In *IG* I^3 85 – fragmentary – the beneficiaries cannot be identified. The *deipnon* for the Athenian Diocleides in 415 BC (And. 1. 45) seems to be an exception rather than evidence of a rooted practice of honoring citizens through the *deipnon*. The hypothesis that the prytaneion decree regulated invitations to *deipnon* is nothing more than that (cf. M. Osborne 1981: 164, 166).

[329] [D.] 50. 13.

[330] See Schmitt Pantel 1992: 167, on the reintegration of citizens through *deipnon*.

a citizen returning home, a foreigner the polis wants to incorporate as a new citizen, or a foreigner with whom the polis merely pretends to negotiate.

But these are not the only functions of the invitation. If there are similarities where there seem to be differences, on the one hand, there are differences where things look similar, on the other. While for citizens the invitation is always a reward for services – a counter-gift – for foreigners it is sometimes a reward, sometimes a gift – a hospitality gift with which the polis initiates negotiations. Literary sources make the reward character of the *deipnon* for Athenian ambassadors particularly clear. Aeschines, for example, says in defense of his activity as an Athenian envoy to Philip II in 346 BC:

> On our return, then, after we had rendered to the council a brief report of our mission and had delivered the letter from Philip, Demosthenes praised us to his colleagues in the council, and he swore by Hestia, goddess of the council, that he congratulated the city on having sent such men on the embassy, men who in honesty and eloquence were worthy of the state. In referring to me he said something like this: that I had not disappointed the hopes of those who elected me to the embassy. And to cap it all he moved that each of us be crowned with a garland of wild olive because of our loyalty to the people, and that we be invited to *deipnon* on the morrow in the prytaneion.[331]

Demosthenes says that inviting Athenian ambassadors was customary: "When I was drafting the provisional resolution of the council respecting the earlier embassy, and again in addressing the people at the assemblies that were held to discuss the terms of peace, *I followed the usual custom*, and included a vote of thanks and an invitation to the public mess-table."[332] Nonetheless, the reward had to be approved and could be refused, as happened to the members of the second embassy to Philip II: "the council, not being debarred from hearing the truth from me, did not give these men either a vote of thanks, or an invitation to the public dinner in the prytaneion."[333] In inscriptions that refer to *deipnon* for Athenian ambassadors, the rule is that the ambassadors are *praised*. A typical example follows: "(it was resolved) to praise Menon, the

[331] Aeschin. 2. 45–6 (tr. Adams, modified). See also Aeschin. 2. 53, 121.

[332] D. 19. 234 (tr. Vince). There is not always a reference to a *deipnon*. See, for example, Aeschin. 2. 13 (vote of thanks for Ctesiphon) and Aeschin. 2. 17 and 3. 83 (crowns for Aristodemus).

[333] D. 19. 31 (tr. Vince). That the denial of honors was unusual does not mean that it never happened before 346 BC. Demosthenes' statement, "we are told that these compliments had never before been withheld from any ambassadors since the foundation of Athens," is an exaggeration intended to bolster his argument.

general, and the ambassadors who were sent to Carystus and invite them to *deipnon* at the prytaneion for tomorrow."[334]

Foreign ambassadors are also generally treated as benefactors. The same standard formula as for Athenian ambassadors is used: "(it was resolved) to praise those who have come as ambassadors of the Thessalians and invite them to *xenia* at the prytaneion for tomorrow." Additional justifications are sometimes included: "because they are taking care of those who come from Athens to Bosphorus" or "since they are good men toward the Athenians."[335] That they are praised, however, is not always stated,[336] an omission that at least in some cases seems related to the fact that the invitation was only a hospitality gift with no connotation of reward. In this regard, it is interesting to note the following inscription, in which the foreign envoys are systematically invited only to *xenia*, while the Athenian envoys receive both praise and entertainment: "(it was resolved) to praise the ambassadors who were sent to Mytilene and invite them to *deipnon* in the prytaneion for tomorrow; to invite the *proedroi* of the Mytileneans to *xenia* at the prytaneion for tomorrow; to invite the *proedroi* of the Methymneans and of the Antissans and of the Eresians and of the Pyrrhans to *xenia* at the prytaneion for tomorrow; . . . to praise the ambassadors who were sent to Lesbos, Timonothus and Autolycus and Aristopithes, and invite them to *deipnon* at the prytaneion for tomorrow."[337] Like Athenian ambassadors, in exceptional cases foreign ambassadors were not invited to the prytaneion. According to Xenophon, in 371 BC, after the battle of Leuctra, the Athenians "did not invite the herald (of the Thebans) to *xenia* and about the matter of aid they gave him no answer."[338] The honor was denied him not because his performance did not deserve it, but because the Thebans' message was not well received.

Study of invitations to *xenia* and *deipnon* has further opened up some issues discussed earlier. In Chapter 3, Section 1.2, I treated the relationship

[334] *IG* II² 124 (tr. Harding 1985: no. 65); other examples are *IG* II² 40; 78; 102; 107; 127; *IG* II³ 398.

[335] The quotations come, respectively, from *IG* II² 116 (tr. Harding 1985: no. 59); *IG* II³ 298 (tr. Harding 1985: no. 82) and *IG* I³ 127 (tr. Fornara 1983: no. 166). The same treatment is awarded benefactors in *IG* I³ 123; *IG* II² 24; 34; 40; 42; 102; 124; *IG* II³ 304; 387; 388; 398; 401.

[336] For example, *IG* I³ 118; *IG* II² 41; 141. From time to time, however, the praise is for the state that sends the ambassadors; *IG* II² 42: "(it was resolved) to praise the city of the Methymneans and invitation shall be issued to the ambassadors of the Methymneans (to come) for xenia" (tr. Harding 1985: no. 37). The ambassadors are thus benefactors to the extent that they are members of the community being praised, rather than because of their own services. See also *IG* II² 1.

[337] *IG* II² 107 (tr. Harding 1985: no. 53).

[338] X. *HG* 6. 4. 19–20 (tr. Brownson).

between guest-friendship or ritualized friendship (*xenia*) and the origins of the institution of euergetism; foreign benefactors were reminiscent of *xenoi*, and the exchange of benefactions and honors was reminiscent of gift-exchange between *xenoi*. Now it is possible to see that the relationship was in some respects even more specific: the hospitality gifts themselves turned into euergetic honors. Furthermore, I stressed earlier the importance of *proxenia* in the development of euergetism: the *proxenos* title was one of the first euergetic rewards and a bridge between the institutions of guest-friendship and euergetism. In the previous discussion, its importance is again apparent. The granting of *xenia* to *proxenoi* transforms *xenia* into euergetic rewards and makes it possible for the *xenia* for ambassadors to become euergetic honors. Finally, the influence of the euergetism of foreigners on the development of civic euergetism is again apparent. Since the *deipnon* in the prytaneion necessarily predated the honor of inviting foreigners to participate in this activity, one might think that the reward of inviting foreigners to *deipnon* precedes the reward of *xenia* in the prytaneion.[339] If my reconstruction is correct, matters were otherwise. The *deipnon* reward for Athenians derived from the *xenia* reward for foreigners. If rewards for foreign ambassadors had not existed, but only *xenia* devoid of any sense of reward, Athenian ambassadors would never have been invited to *deipnon*, no matter how similar the activities of foreign and Athenian ambassadors or the need to integrate them into the polis.

3.5 Deserved and undeserved honors

In the fourth century, the proliferation of honors for citizens, as well as the magnitude of some of them, was occasionally criticized. Some citizens evidently believed that neither the number nor the quality of the benefactions justified the evolution in the granting of honors. Others defended the way benefactors were being honored or tried to differentiate between benefactions (which deserved honors) and services (which did not). Our main source of information for this debate is the orators, who often contrast the scarcity and modesty of fifth-century honors with the abundance and grandeur of those of the fourth century. Their opinions differ, depending on the context and motivation of the speech, to the extent that some orators patently contradict themselves. They nonetheless reflect the ongoing debate about the granting of honors.

[339] This is the impression one might get from reading Schmitt Pantel 1992 and Spitzer 1994.

Demosthenes in his *Against Aristocrates* (352 BC) criticizes the honors awarded to generals:

> It is also opportune, men of Athens, to inquire how our forefathers bestowed distinctions (*timai*) and rewards (*dôreai*) upon genuine benefactors, whether they were citizens or strangers. If you find their practice better than yours, you will do well to follow their example; if you prefer your own, it rests with you to continue it. Take first Themistocles, who won the naval victory at Salamis, Miltiades, who commanded at Marathon, and many others, whose achievements were not on a level with those of our commanders today. Our ancestors did not put up bronze statues of these men, nor did they carry their regard for them to extremes. . . . It really looks as though you disclaimed any merit for those feats of arms by the extravagant favors that you lavish on the several commanders. Thus they distributed rewards within the city righteously and to the public advantage; we do it the wrong way.[340]

On the other hand, a few years earlier, in his *Against Leptines* (355 BC), written on behalf of the son of the general Chabrias, Demosthenes had supported the honors awarded Conon and Chabrias.[341] The focus of the speech was actually a defense of the exemption from liturgies, an additional reward given to Conon and Chabrias but abolished at the initiative of Leptines. Aware that he would be attacked by Leptines with the argument that fifth-century benefactors were less lavishly rewarded,[342] Demosthenes stresses that in earlier times as well benefactors received honors, and he maintains that every epoch rewards benefactors differently: "There were, men of Athens, plenty of zealous citizens in former generations, and our city even then honored its good men; only honors then, like everything else, reflected the temper of the times, just as they now reflect the temper of today."[343] Demosthenes insists that it is important to reward benefactors: "Is it right, Athenians, to honor your benefactors? It is."[344] Not only great services but also less significant ones deserve recognition, and honors must be proportional to benefactions:

> Further, even if this difficulty were not likely to arise, I cannot think that it is well to bring the state into this dilemma, that it must either put all citizens on an equality with its greatest benefactors, or to avoid this must treat some with ingratitude. . . . The moderate benefactions to which one can aim in time of

[340] D. 23. 196–9 (tr. Vince). Similar in [D.] 13. 22–3.

[341] D. 20. 68 ff. (Conon), 75 ff. (Chabrias). Demosthenes clearly defends all their honors, including their statues, and not only the *ateleia* from liturgies. Cf. D. 20. 68, 70, 74, 81, 82, 120.

[342] D. 20. 112: "they have another argument ready; that even at Athens in former generations men who had rendered great services met with no recognition of this sort" (tr. Vince).

[343] D. 20. 114 (tr. Vince). See also D. 20. 115–17.

[344] D. 20. 119. See also D. 20. 6, 39, 54, 57, 142.

peace and in the civil sphere – loyalty, justice, zeal and the like – it is, in my opinion, both well and necessary that they should be rewarded. Grants ought, therefore, to be so apportioned that each man may receive from the people the exact reward that he deserves.[345]

Some years later, in 330 BC, when his crown was challenged by Aeschines, Demosthenes again defended the importance of honoring benefactors. Unsurprisingly, he argued that services like his donations to the *theôrikon* and the reconstruction of the city walls for which he received the crown deserved to be rewarded.[346] But he also insisted that good political advice and administration were themselves worthy of honors: "And then, Aeschines, you ask for what merit do I deserve to be honored! ... With a soul upright, honest and incorruptible, appointed to the control of more momentous transactions than any statesman of my time, I have administered them throughout in all purity and righteousness. On those grounds I think I deserve to be honored!"[347] In the same speech, Demosthenes also claimed again that it was unjust to criticize contemporary honors by comparing them with those awarded in the past.[348]

Aeschines, by contrast, offered the following case in criticism of the proliferation of honors in his own day:

> If any one should ask you whether our city seems to you more glorious in our own time or in the time of our fathers, you would agree, in the time of our fathers. And were there better men then than now? Then, eminent men; but now, far inferior. But *dôreai* and crowns and proclamations, and maintenance in the prytaneion – were these things more common then than now? Then honors were rare among us, and the name of virtue was itself an honor. But now, the custom is already completely faded out, and you do the crowning as a matter of habit, not deliberately. Are you not therefore surprised, when you look at it in this light, that the rewards are now more numerous, but the city was then more prosperous?[349]

But most Athenians who attended the assembly apparently did not think the same way – or if they did, that did not prevent them from supporting the granting of honors. We have already seen the complicated motives that surrounded the great honors bestowed on generals. As for the lesser honors, the Athenians were aware that these served a practical purpose: they promoted contributions to the polis by wealthy citizens at a time when these had become more necessary. On the other hand, the fact that many

[345] D. 20. 121–2 (tr. Vince).
[346] D. 18. 4, 79–83, 86–8, 93–4, 102, 107, 108, 112–13, 117, 119, 222, 257, 298–303, 311–12.
[347] D. 18. 297–9 (tr. Vince, modified). [348] D. 18. 316. [349] Aeschin. 3. 178–9 (tr. Adams).

more citizens – including poor men serving on the boule – might aim at becoming *euergetai* if honors were awarded for public services must have increased the support given the system.

As was apparent as early as when Cleon requested significant honors for himself, this new situation made some Athenians uncomfortable. The institution of euergetism was initially instituted with interactions with foreigners in mind, and its application to the regulation of internal relationships was complicated, given the Athenians' inclination toward egalitarianism, and the difficulty of distinguishing duties from benefactions. But euergetism was nonetheless fully at work in fourth-century Athens. Far from managing only relationships between the polis and foreigners or athletes, the institution was now part of the lives of a wide sector of the community: generals, magistrates, councilors, liturgists, and other generous citizens. The ground had been prepared for the triumph of euergetism in Hellenistic times. What was missing was only a change in the power relationships between the elite and the demos, and between the polis and political actors outside of it.

4 Epilogue: sequence and causal relationships

The arguments of this chapter lead to the following reconstruction of the basic sequence – with continuities and discontinuities – and main causal relationships of the increase (more instances) and expansion (new variants) of civic euergetism in Athens at the end of the fifth century and throughout the fourth. The process began with the proliferation of crowns for generals as a result of the Peloponnesian War.[350] This phenomenon challenged the egalitarian ethos promoted by the democratic regime, but it took into account the reciprocity principle – gifts had to be reciprocated; reacted to the demands of the commanders (Cleon being the best example);[351] found precedents in awards for valour (*aristeia*), as well as in the *sitêsis* (and probably *proedria*) for generals regulated by the prytaneion decree;[352] and responded to the logic of a state of war: to motivate the military and promote patriotic role models. To a similar logic – the defense of democracy, but against internal enemies – were owed the grants of crowns at that

[350] See in particular the references in And. 2. 18 (from between 410 BC and 405 BC) and X. *HG* 1. 33 (alluding to 406 BC). To this period belongs the crown for Alcibiades in 408 (Plu. *Alc*. 33.2). At the time when Cleon was awarded a crown (Ar. *Eq*. 1225–54), the phenomenon was presumably less common, although it must be noted that his crown did not provoke the same controversy as his *sitêsis* and *proedria* (Ar. *Eq*. 280–3, 573–6, 702).

[351] Ar. *Eq*. 573–6. [352] *IG* I^3 131.

time to Athenians such as Diocleides (415 BC)[353] and the men who freed the polis from the Thirty Tyrants (403 BC),[354] honors that had as precedents those awarded to the defenders of democracy par excellence, Harmodius and Aristogiton.[355] But the Peloponnesian War also brought a change that was quantitatively less visible than the crowns for commanders, but qualitatively more significant than such crowns or even the honors for defenders of the state against internal attacks: the recognition of benefactions such as supplying grain that, although linked to war, had an economic dimension.[356] This implied not only distinguishing some citizens from others but also accepting the public recompense of donations, favors that because of the kind of dependence they generated and their archaic and pre-democratic connotations the Athenian demos preferred to avoid or at least not acknowledge. At the same time, the polis had to increase the number of *triêrarchiai* and *eisphorai*, services belonging to a different category – liturgies – that was outside the system of honors. From evidence such as Isocrates' reference to his disciples' contributions or the testimony of the *triêrarchos* Apollodorus about his services in 362/1 BC,[357] we can infer that after the Peloponnesian War, in the first half of the fourth century, economic benefactions and their recognition continued and increased. Without the resources of the empire, Athens could not simply increase the number of trierarchies and *eisphorai*, since these contributions covered only military expenses. In this context, citizens began to receive honors (*deipnon* and public praise) also for serving as ambassadors, a custom for which we have epigraphic information from the 370s on.[358] The great honors (especially the statue) offered to some generals from 393 BC until 375 BC[359] reflect not only the scale of their benefactions or their symbolic manipulation by the polis but also the fact that at that time the bestowal of crowns and public praise had grown to such an extent that the polis sometimes had to draw on higher honors (in some cases, such as those of Conon and Chabrias, bestowed in addition to crowns).

[353] And. 1. 45. [354] X. *HG* 2. 4. 2 ff; Aeschin. 3. 187–90; Nep. 8. 4. 1; *SEG* XXVIII 45.
[355] "Simon." 131 Bergk = *FGE* 684–7 = *CEG* 430; Meritt 1936: 355 ff.; Raaflaub 2003: 64; *IG* I^3 131; Is. 5. 47; D. 20. 127–30, 159.
[356] And. 2. 10–12, 17–18; Isoc. 18. 61, 65. [357] Isoc. 15. 94; [D.] 50. 13.
[358] *IG* II^2 40; 70; *SEG* XXI 230.
[359] Conon: statue (D. 20. 70; Isoc. 9. 57; Paus. 1. 3. 2; Nep. 13. 2. 3), gold crown (D. 22. 72; 24. 180), *ateleia* (D. 20. 70), probably also *sitêsis* and *proedria* (Isoc. 9. 57; cf. schol. D. 21. 62). Iphicrates: statue (Aeschin. 3. 243; D. 21. 62; 23. 130, 136; Arist. *Rh.* 1397^{b}27–30); *sitêsis, proedria*, "and other honors" (D. 23. 130, 136; schol. D. 21. 62). Chabrias: statue (Aeschin. 3. 243; Arist. *Rh.* 1411^{b}6–7; D.S. 15. 33. 4; Nep. 12. 1), gold crown (D. 24. 180), *ateleia* (D. 20. 75, 79, 86, 146), "other honors" (Aeschin. 3. 243. D. 20. 146). Timotheus: statue (Aeschin. 3. 243; Nep. 13. 2. 3; Paus. 1. 3. 2). On other commanders possibly honored with statues, Aeschin. 3. 143.

According to Isocrates, around 400 BC the granting of crowns had already increased significantly compared with the final years of the Peloponnesian War.[360] But the proliferation of crowns in the decades following the Peloponnesian War was not due only to the acknowledgment of military, political and economic benefactions. Another contribution to this phenomenon were the crowns conferred on members of the boule. From at least 408/7 BC on, it was customary to distinguish the best prytany of the year with a crown – there are numerous dedications from the first half of the fourth century providing evidence for this practice[361] – and according to Demosthenes, by 357–4 BC it had become habitual to bestow a crown on the boule for successful management of its year in office.[362] Such honors served to democratize euergetism, giving access to honors to men who were not wealthy. In this sense, they may have been in part a reaction to the increasing honors for the elite.[363] But most likely they must also be understood as acts of democratic reaffirmation after the successive oligarchic crises of 411 BC and 404 BC, as a way to increase identification with the democratic regime and strengthen it in the spirit of Demophantus' decree.[364]

While honors to commanders and generous citizens, even if they served to promote engagement with the polis, seem to have been to a significant degree concessions to the benefactors' demands to be rewarded, honors for *bouleutai* seem to constitute the first attempt of the polis to use honors as a specific strategy to encourage citizens to try to improve the government and management of the polis. After the Social War (357–355 BC), this use of euergetism became more evident with the systematic granting of honors to officers for their performance, and from the 340s on, it is reflected in the decrees with the inclusion of a reference to the honorand's *philotimia* and an invitation to follow his example.[365] In the fourth century, one sees many reforms intended to improve the polis' administration, and civic euergetism, increasingly regulated by laws, became part of these efforts. Behind the honors for officers, however, was not only an attempt to improve their performance – or sometimes simply to find people willing to serve – but also a desire to obtain resources. One goal was to get citizens such as Neoptolemus son of Anticles, Demosthenes, Pytheas of Alopece, and Phanodemus of Thymaetadae to contribute from their own money during the course of their public duties as commissioners of public

[360] Isoc. 18. 65. [361] Cf. the first 30 inscriptions in *Agora* XV 1. [362] D. 22. 5, 8, 36–7.
[363] That the crown to the best prytany goes back to the beginnings of democracy (Dow 1937: 2; Meritt and Traill 1974: 2) is simply speculation.
[364] Cf. And. 1. 96–8; D. 20. 159; Lycurg. 1. 127.
[365] E.g. *IG* II³ 338; 348; 355; 416. Cf. Xenophon's recommendation in *Vect.* 3. 3.

works, superintendents of wells, *nomothetai* of public festivals, and the like.[366] Financial need was certainly far more important in the development of civic euergetism than the prose of the decrees suggests, which is not much, given how problematic it was for Athenians to recognize donations by citizens. (The speeches of the orators, by contrast, are more explicit.[367]) After each major military defeat (Peloponnesian War, Social War, and Chaeronea), there was a new impetus to civic euergetism, and this development can be followed through literary and epigraphic sources. It is true that the change in the epigraphic habit – that decrees in honor of citizens were not regularly inscribed until the 340s – creates some distortion, but the simple fact that the change took place is revealing. Political questions such as the intention of strengthening the commitment of citizens to the state after a crisis must have exercised an influence. But there is also clearly a correlation between the development of civic euergetism and the economic difficulties after each military defeat, the same difficulties that led, with much resistance, to the conferral of honors on foreigners of non-high status for trade-related services. (The inscription of decrees honoring such services becomes frequent after Chaeronea.[368])

The Athenians put some limits on the incorporation of economic benefactions into civic euergetism. They believed that the greater the control by the state, the lower the danger of donations. The liturgy was the paradigm, since in that context, contrary to the norm in gift-exchange, control rested not with the giver but with the recipient, who determined the donor, the minimum amount, its purpose, and even whether the donation was considered a gift. Donating via liturgy might confer influence on the donor, but in the democratic polis the liturgy manifested the power of the demos. Athens therefore tried to limit the granting of honors – and so public recognition of gifts – to contributions made in a framework in which the polis would maintain (or seem to maintain) control with no challenge to its sovereignty. Most donations publicly rewarded as benefactions took place in the exercise of public functions. Others – the minority – were made through *epidoseis*, which were (provided economic euergetism was accepted) the ideal option, since they emphasized the importance of collective efforts. In the time of Lycurgus, however, the policy of the polis

[366] Neoptolemus: D. 18. 114. Demosthenes: D. 18. 112–13, 117–19, 299, 311. See also Aeschin. 3. 17; Plu. *Mor*. 845f–6a. Pytheas: *IG* II^3 338. Phanodemus: *IG* II^3 348.

[367] Aeschin. 3. 17: "I (Demosthenes) am in charge of the construction of the walls, I admit it, but I have made a present of a hundred minas to the state, and I have carried out the work on a larger scale than was prescribed" (tr. Adams).

[368] Engen 2010.

regarding donations and their compensation grew more relaxed. We know of significant donations made outside public office, such as the donation of land to the polis by Deinias on the occasion of the construction of the Panathenaic stadium, and the gilding of the altar of Apollo by Neoptolemus.[369] But there must have been many more, if it is true that under Lycurgus, Athens' annual revenues increased from 600 to 1,200 talents.[370] Some of these benefactions, such as Neoptolemus', must have been rewarded with honors.

The process toward recognition of economic benefactions was facilitated by the debate surrounding liturgies. The increase in the number of liturgies and *eisphorai* since the end of the Peloponnesian War and the negative reaction of many members of the liturgical class to this increased financial pressure[371] led, as the forensic literature makes clear, to a debate in which the rich were often accused of forsaking their financial obligations. For their part, they defended themselves by presenting their contributions as more than they were obliged to make. Moreover, they used these contributions to counter accusations unrelated to liturgies and *eisphorai*. This debate made explicit what had so far been expressed less openly (through informal counter-gifts): some financial contributions were true benefactions, which deserved recognition and rewards. Demosthenes in his *Against Leptines* (355 BC) makes this clear. On the other hand, the discourse of the polis, by insisting that liturgists' services were contributions owed the polis (counter-gifts in a community based on indirect reciprocity, in which each member contributed according to his ability),[372] along with the suspicion that many rich did not contribute as they should, obscured the beneficent character of liturgies performed voluntarily or beyond what was required, thereby reducing liturgists' profits in terms of symbolic capital. In addition, the introduction of *symmoriai* in the organization of the trierarchy made it more difficult for individual liturgists to stand out. For members of the elite in search of symbolic capital through donations, therefore, euergetic honors and the sectors of public life where they could be obtained became more relevant. But the expansion of civic euergetism was also encouraged by developments in another area, the subdivisions of the polis: *phylai, phratriai*, and above all demes. At the local level of the demes, civic euergetism progressed faster than it did at the polis level. The sources, mainly epigraphic, show that in the demes civic euergetism

[369] Plu. *Mor*. 841d, 843f. [370] Plu. *Mor*. 842f.

[371] For example, Lys. 7. 31–2; 18. 3; 19. 9, 29, 57–9; 26. 22; 28. 3; 29. 4; 30. 26; X. *HG* 6. 2. 1; *Smp*. 4. 30–2; Isoc. 8. 128; 12. 12, 145; 15. 160; Is. 4. 27; 6. 60–1; 7. 40; D. 1. 8–9; 18. 102; 21. 61; 24. 197–8; 28. 17; 38. 26; [D.] 47. 54; 50. 8–9; 52. 26; D.S. 13. 47. 7, 52.

[372] The wealthy who did not contribute their share were robbing their fellow citizens: X. *Oec*. 2. 6.

and the inscription of decrees in honor of citizens was well established in the first half of the fourth century.[373] This probably had to do with aspects as diverse as the fact that deme elites were more powerful, fewer expenses were covered by public money, and activities not considered benefactions by the polis (e.g., choregic victories) received this consideration by the demes.

Throughout the fourth century, contributions to the polis progressed toward a system increasingly closer to Hellenistic civic euergetism, characterized by (a) the importance of economic benefactions compared with other types (political, military, athletic, and intellectual), (b) a close relationship between public office and economic benefactions (the officer was expected to spend his own money), and (c) the development of private economic benefactions (donations made outside the context of public office). Athens moved toward this type of euergetism on several fronts. Liturgies – services based not only on the expenditure of the liturgist but also on his performance – were supplemented by *eisphorai*, simple monetary donations. After the introduction of *symmoriai* in 357 BC, the *triêrarchia* became for most liturgists a mere pecuniary contribution. Gifts made through *epidoseis* were likewise only donations, and indeed donations openly acknowledged as benefactions. Donations by officials and the fact that they were expected and even encouraged by the polis manifest the relationship between offices and donations characteristic of the Hellenistic period. Interestingly, this trend did not pass unnoticed by Aristotle. In a premonitory text, he describes an ideal polis in which only the wealthy can undertake magistracies because they are linked to the assumption of expenses. The rich also offer sacrifice and spend money on public buildings, and the demos gratefully accepts their power:

> The most supreme offices . . . must have liturgies attached to them, in order that the common people may be willing to be excluded from them, and may feel no resentment against the ruling class, because it pays a high price for office. And it fits in with this that they should offer splendid sacrifices and build up some public monument on entering upon office, so that the common people sharing in the festivities and seeing the city decorated both with votive offerings and with buildings may be glad to see the constitution enduring; and an additional result will be that the notables will have memorials of their outlay.[374]

The evolution toward this model in fourth-century Athens – visible especially in the final third of the century – has been called the

[373] E.g. *IG* II^2 1173; 1178; 1179; 1182; 2820; 2829; *SEG* XXIV 153; 197.
[374] Arist. *Pol.* 1321^{a}32–41 (tr. Rackham).

"liturgization of Athenian offices."[375] In reality, it was more a "euergetization," since officials' donations were honored as benefactions, the kind of transaction the elite preferred. If the demos' model was the liturgy, the elite's was euergetism, and thus the most Hellenistic one. As noted, however, in the time of Lycurgus there were also large private donations made outside of office, which were recognized as benefactions. Someone such as Neoptolemus anticipates the arrival of the great Hellenistic *euergetai*. He is a "total" benefactor, active in all fields: he makes donations as an official (as supervisor of public works), as a private person not fulfilling any public function (gilding the altar of Apollo), and as a member of his deme (reconstruction of the temple of Artemis Aristoboule and other benefactions in Melite).[376] He is reminiscent of another total benefactor, Cimon, who in the transition from archaic to classical society was active in the same three capacities by means of liturgies, private donations to the polis, and gifts to fellow demesmen.[377] Unlike Cimon, however, Neoptolemus was honored for each of these services, and for one of them – the most spectacular – with a statue. The great honor that up to that point had been awarded exclusively for political and military services was finally granted for a donation. Neoptolemus, who as benefactor of his deme was rewarded with a crown, embodies the evolution of civic euergetism in fourth-century Athens, which went to some extent from deme euergetism to polis euergetism.

Nor is it only some manifestations of civic euergetism – donations outside public functions and the connection between offices and benefactions – that bring us closer to the Hellenistic period. Civic euergetism by itself, no matter how democratic it may have been in some of its manifestations (*epidoseis*, honors for *bouleutai*), was a Hellenistic-minded institution (assuming one accepts that the Hellenistic polis was a community dominated by the elite).[378] Honors theoretically rebalanced the relationship between the polis and the benefactor – they were *dôreai* like benefactions, equivalent counter-gifts – and made additional unofficial compensations, such as political support, unnecessary. But the truth is that honors were inevitably accompanied by symbolic capital that gave their recipients power beyond the control of the polis. Honors for financial benefactions accordingly represented in part a return to the time when the liturgical

[375] Hakkarainen 1997: 21.
[376] D. 18. 114; Plu. *Mor*. 843f; *SEG* XXII 116.
[377] *FGrH* 115 F 89 and F 135 ap. Ath. 12. 532f–3c; [Arist.] *Ath*. 27. 2–3; Cratin. fr. 1 K–A; Gorg. 82 B 20 D–K ap. Plu. *Cim*. 10.5; Plu. *Cim* 13. 7–8; Judeich 1931: 73–4, 314, 352.
[378] On this controversial question, cf. Ste Croix 1981: 300–326; Gruen 1993: 339–54; Mann and Scholz 2012.

system allowed the accumulation of symbolic capital that would become more difficult to achieve with the introduction of *eisphorai, symmoriai*, and the fourth-century polis discourse on liturgies. But euergetism went further. While in a system of liturgies it was possible to depict a liturgy as a service due the polis rather than an act of liberality, a benefaction sanctioned by the state as *euergesia* was unambiguous. This may be one reason why the Athenians resisted inscribing decrees in honor of citizens: the granting of a crown or public praise – punctual acts – was one thing, but a monument that in addition to unambiguously proclaiming a certain action as a benefaction served as a permanent reminder that a citizen was a benefactor was another. Although civic euergetism was invented by a democratic regime, its natural environment was a polis ruled by the elite.

Conclusions

Euergetism was a creation of the archaic polis. It began as a way of organizing the exchange of services and rewards between the community of citizens and foreigners and was modeled on an institution that predated the emergence of the polis: ritualized friendship or *xenia*. Several factors help explain this connection, which is readily apparent in the fact that one of the first euergetic rewards – if not the very first – was *proxenia*. In both cases, the relationship was with individuals from "outside"; benefactors of the polis were often associated with one of its citizens via a preexisting relationship of *xenia*; the *xenos* cared not only for his partner *xenos* but also for his partner's relatives, friends, and fellow citizens as well. Above all else, what characterized *xenia* was the exchange of gifts, and while the establishment of relationships between the polis and foreigners evoked the older institution, the recollection of *xenia* based on the other similarities simultaneously triggered further such exchanges. Put another way, the existence of *xenia* prompted a form of interaction between the polis and foreigners for which gifts were an essential component. By the end of the archaic period, most euergetic rewards were in place: inscriptions in honor of benefactors, *proxenia*, exemption from taxes (*ateleia*), free meals in the prytaneion (*sitêsis*), the right to own land (*enktêsis*), and treatment as an *euergetês*.

The history of the origins of euergetism is thus quite brief. The primary focus of this book has been instead the long process by which citizens were incorporated into an institution designed for foreigners, a development that continued into the Hellenistic age and ended with the transformation of euergetism into a key mechanism in the relationship between mass and elite, and between the polis and kings. But the amount of time this process required – approximately 300 years – does not mean that citizen euergetism was absent from the archaic polis. Athletes who were victorious in Panhellenic games were rewarded with ceremonial receptions, *sitêsis, proedria*, statues, and *dorêai*. Some individuals also performed major services

(including liturgies) for their cities or made substantial monetary donations to them, and some of these contributions were perceived as gifts. As Xenophanes and other sources make clear, the idea of benefactions to fellow-citizens already existed at this point. But there were also obstacles to the creation of an institution of euergetism. The sense of indebtedness created by the gifts of the elites served to maintain the social status quo but made rewards for benefactions counterproductive. The counter-gift elites were pursuing was subordination; honors for athletic winners were an exceptional measure, which served to integrate the authors of problematic benefactions that might arouse envy or the fear of tyranny to unite the community around a common success, and to extend honors reminiscent of those already awarded at the site of the games. The difficulty of evaluating contributions made by elites also made the expansion of civic euergetism more difficult. Were these gifts or counter-gifts? The polis was an entity based on direct and indirect reciprocity between its members, and the fairness of any exchange was assessed according to the basic rules of gift exchange; what the gift represented in terms of costs, effort, and generosity was taken into account. Spectacular donations could accordingly be perceived as gifts owed to the community, that is, as counter-gifts, as in fourth-century Athens in particular, where this approach served to require and justify large contributions by the elite.

In classical Athens, the development of euergetism encountered additional obstacles. Chief among these was the demos' aversion to gifts from the elite because of the gifts' manipulative capacity and their connection with the cliental relationships typical of the archaic period. Moreover, the democratic system and the resources of the Delian League meant that the demos now had the political power and economic means to reject gifts. But the other side of euergetism – rewards – also posed problems. After the posthumous grant of great honors to Harmodius and Aristogiton, it became difficult to reward other citizens in a way that put them on a level close to the Tyrannicides. In addition, the formation of a caste of *euergetai* challenged the egalitarianism the polis promoted. For most of the fifth century, the only door open to the growth of euergetism was through liturgies, an institution inherited from the archaic polis, but which in the democratic period became a sign of the demos' superiority over the elite. Wealthy citizens looking for political support or simply for a way to display their social preeminence could make large donations as liturgists.

The Peloponnesian War marked a turning point in the history of euergetism. Military commanders became prominent in Athens, and it was increasingly common to reward their services to the polis with crowns,

sitêsis, and *proedria*. Other citizens were honored with crowns for economic benefactions linked to the war (e.g., for ensuring the supply of grain) or sometimes for political accomplishments, as in the case of Diocleides. After the war, at a time when the Athenians wanted to signal the revival of their city, they chose to honor Conon with a statue, the same distinction used to mark the refounding of the polis symbolically carried out by the Tyrannicides. Iphicrates, Chabrias, and Timotheus were honored in the same way – not without criticism. The expansion of euergetism was also stimulated by the loss of the economic resources of the empire, a problem that became acute after the Social War (357–355 BC). Athens now had no alternative but to draw on the resources of the rich. Full use was therefore made of the liturgical system, although this proved an insufficient and in some ways inadequate response to the situation and created enormous discontent among the elite. The rules of gift-exchange demanded that those who acted to benefit the polis be reciprocated, while pragmatism required a more efficient system to attract donations. It also became clear that euergetism could be used to improve the management of the polis by rewarding officials and members of the boule for outstanding performance of their duties. The birth of the *system of euergetism* must accordingly be understood as part of the general effort by the fourth-century Athenian polis to rationalize and improve its government and finances, a tendency toward administrative sophistication reflected in other innovations (e.g., the introduction of *merismos, stratiôtika* and *symmoriai*) as well.

The habit of honoring citizens for benefactions was not simply a copy of the tribute paid to foreign benefactors. Earlier practices announced the possibility of this development and laid its foundations: awards of valor (*aristeia*); prizes for liturgists involved in choregic and athletic competitions, and perhaps for non-agonistic liturgies such as trierarchies; the paintings in the Stoa Poikile; and the monuments for the heroes of Marathon (and/or Salamis) and Eion. Although in the early stages of euergetism such prizes served as rewards, by the time of Demosthenes the opposite phenomenon is apparent: official rewards became prizes in an unofficial competition, the political agon. The fourth century also saw the decentralization and democratization of euergetism. In parallel with developments at the polis level, benefactions addressed to individual demes and the honors granted in response increased in this period. This decentralization implied democratization, in that individuals who lacked the means or influence to become *euergetai* of the polis as a whole could achieve this status in their demes. In the same vein, the extension of honors to members of the boule and other officials and the organization of *epidoseis* (public

subscriptions) allowed benefactors of relatively modest means to be recognized as *euergetai*. Athens resisted civic euergetism for many years; when the city finally made use of the practice, it attempted to adapt it to democratic ideology. It is ironic that the polis that was perhaps the least keen on civic euergetism developed it, and this paradox contains another: the conditions that delayed the appearance of euergetism (the resources of the Delian League and democracy) contributed decisively to the formation of the institution. The prosperity of the period between the Persian Wars and the Peloponnesian War created a state (and an empire) that required large sums of money to subsidize the political participation of citizens and to cover other institutional and military expenses. When donations became indispensable again, they were accordingly seen less as "natural" emanations from the elite and more as gifts. Finally, the democratic system prevented the donations of the elite from being understood primarily as compensation for political privileges. One tends to imagine euergetism as a phenomenon intrinsically linked to a minority, the "notables" of Paul Veyne or the "Honoratiorenschicht" of Max Weber and Friedemann Quass. In fact, civic euergetism was invented by the Athenian democracy.

But the history of euergetism is more than the history of an institution. It is also the history of a struggle for power and dominance. Archaic elites seem to have used gifts to dominate the demos (the case of tyrants being the best documented). When the fifth-century Athenian demos rejected gifts to avoid such domination, members of the elite attempted to gain political support by means of gifts in the context of liturgies. This history of power relationships contains a further paradox: the fact that in the fourth century, although the Athenians demos was forced to accept and request gifts from the elite, the power of the wealthy did not increase. On the contrary, it became more difficult to use gifts to control the demos. Since many of the rich opposed liturgies and *eisphorai*, and some even managed to avoid them, the polis had to stress that these services were owed the community. Insistence on this point, together with the suspicion that many wealthy citizens were contributing less than required or were not contributing at all, eclipsed the generosity of those who volunteered to carry out liturgies or performed them in a way that surpassed what was asked of them. In law court speeches, individuals who present themselves as the polis' most generous benefactors are routinely accused of being precisely the opposite. In 415 BC, Alcibiades tried to convince his fellow citizens that they owed him appointment as commander of the Sicilian expedition because he had contributed so much to the polis. In fourth-century Athens, such arguments carried less weight, and politicians could rely less on their money

than their fifth-century predecessors had. Significantly, when Demosthenes was forced to defend the crown Athens had granted him against Aeschines' attacks, he said little about the services (donations to the reconstruction of the city's walls and to the *theôrikon*) for which he received this honor and focused instead on his performance as a politician and a public adviser.

If depicting gifts as services due the polis was a rhetorical device to avoid the subordination that resulted from them, awarding honors was to some degree a non-rhetorical response to the problem. In principle, honors (*dôreai*) represented a cancellation of the debt, and in some cases they might really have helped diminish the power of gifts. But they also contributed to creating *euergetai*, citizens who could exhibit undisputable benefactions.

Analysis of the relationship between gifts and power shows that the ability to influence others depended not only on the capacity of gifts to indebt the recipient but also on their relationship to public discourse: on whether they were mentioned or deliberately ignored, and (when they were mentioned) on how they were depicted. Moreover, public discourse could not only reinforce or neutralize the power of gifts but also even invent them, and this represents the most extreme fashion in which rhetoric gave gifts their power. While fifth-century Athens tried to avoid indebtedness from gifts by preventing them from being made, and fourth-century Athens portrayed gifts as counter-gifts, the Hellenistic poleis tended to characterize gifts as donations deserving compensation. A key element in the construction of this discourse was the proliferation of honors, which made a significant contribution to forging the idea that the donor was, above all else, a benefactor. From early on, but principally in the Hellenistic period, the importance of certain gifts in the interplay between poleis and external agents was exaggerated, so as to justify disproportionate honors. Gifts were also invented to present subsequent gifts as counter-gifts. This was not only done to disguise the fact that apparent counter-gifts (honors) aimed at actual counter-gifts. Rhetoric was connected with power: in some situations, gifts were more efficient – they facilitated the exchange – when presented as counter-gifts. The addressee of a gift was more comfortable when treated as a giver, because the initiator of the exchange was perceived as occupying a superior position hierarchically, since the receiver remained indebted until he replied; strategically, because the originator of the transaction determined through his gift the magnitude of the counter-gift; and morally, because a gift, which ran the risk of not being reciprocated, was seen as more generous than a counter-gift,

which was in principle mere compensation. Although the counter-gift might conceivably surpass the gift, it was difficult to prove that the generosity of the former outweighed the risk of not receiving something in return, and the perception that its main function was to cancel a debt remained.

Nonetheless, the act of introducing a gift as a counter-gift, despite implying a more relaxed position for the beneficiary, put pressure on him to reciprocate, a pressure related to how he reconciled the contradiction between image and reality. The false counter-gift liberated the beneficiary from external pressure (*viz.* from observers) to respond. But because of this, he experienced the gift internally as more generous than an open gift would have been. In addition, the need to adjust reality to a discourse that portrayed him as a benefactor compelled him to reply with gifts. This inclination was especially strong when the recipient was a Hellenistic king, since cultivating the image of a benefactor was an essential component of his efforts to legitimize his monarchy. Removing the discomfort of being seen as the recipient was also helpful in exchanges with other high-status individuals, such as royal officers and prominent citizens from other poleis, who had to be approached diplomatically and did not like to appear to be in a subordinate position. Gifts not only *created* relationships of power and dominance. They also fit into *preexisting* relationships of power, because the players (demos, elite, polis, and king) differed in rank, wealth, military capacity, and the like; the rhetoric of euergetism had to take this into account, along with differences in status resulting from the laws of gift-exchange themselves.

Shaping public discourse in a way that could depart so far from reality as to present gifts as counter-gifts (honors), or – what amounts to the same thing – to award honors in advance (proleptic honors), was more natural than it might seem at first. The designation of both gifts and rewards as *dôreai* indicates that although the Greeks distinguished between these categories (as honorific decrees demonstrate), they still saw them as essentially identical: these were all gifts and thus in one sense interchangeable. Beyond that, the importance of reciprocity, the fact that gifts implied counter-gifts to such an extent that they were almost two sides of the same coin, allowed gifts to be rewarded even before they were made. The outcome would always be the same – a gift and a reward – regardless of the order of occurrence.

Disproportionate honors and proleptic honors often pursued concrete ends, such as support for public subscriptions, abolition of tribute, or political autonomy. The same can be said of certain benefactions,

such as those by members of the elite trying to gain political support, or by kings looking for the loyalty of poleis. But not all euergetic gifts were so self-interested. Some benefactions seem to have been driven by patriotism, whereas some honors appear to have been inspired by genuine gratitude. Donations could also be motivated by social pressure, a less noble root, but one related to no clear interest other than self-protection. And even euergetic gifts that aimed at benefits were not all equally self-interested. Some were intended primarily to initiate or perpetuate a relationship (which might bring benefits in the future); others pursued specific advantages of the types mentioned earlier. This was very different from genuine gift-exchange, especially when negotiations looking for the best way to benefit both sides were involved. Yet those negotiations were not explicit, the interest in obtaining benefits was hidden, the rhetoric was one of generosity, and the intent was always to maintain the form of gift-exchange. In exchanges between poleis and Hellenistic kings, this served to convey the message that such connections were in the tradition of those between the sovereign poleis of the classical period and their foreign benefactors, that is, between friends who exchanged presents (a fiction that helped the poleis bear the humiliating reality of subordination, while facilitating the rule of kings in a world hostile to monarchy). Similarly, in dealings between demos and elite, the fact that euergetism appeared as gift-exchange was important in presenting this as an interaction between equals, avoiding the impression of a client/patron relation.

If gift-exchange helps explain euergetism, the history of the institution also contributes to our knowledge of Greek gift-exchange. Particularly in the fourth century, when there was considerable debate about what could be considered a benefaction, the resources and potential of the giver played an important role in evaluating the fairness of any exchange. A key aspect was generosity, what it cost the giver to renounce that which constituted the gift. Taking generosity into consideration, therefore, an exchange that benefited one side less than the other or even involved a loss could still be considered balanced. This conception of gift-exchange was born of the need to help the weakest members of society and to keep the group united. Euergetism, which highlighted helping the community (giving in the form of benefaction/*euergesia*), is a good metaphor for this conception of gift-exchange; the term "metaphor" is appropriate because there was often considerable selfishness behind the facade of generosity, and because the "benefactor" sometimes gained as much from the exchange as the recipient of the benefaction did, or more.

The final paradox of euergetism is that the act of approaching the other (performing a benefaction) implied distancing oneself from the community through honors. This paradox was one virtue of euergetism. It reconciled the demos' insistence on integrating the elite into the polis with the elite's desire to stand out from the mass, and it sometimes reconciled contradictions within the elite themselves, their altruistic inclination to help fellow citizens and their agonistic tendency to surpass them. These qualities, together with the advantages of channeling the king/polis relationships, help explain the longevity of the institution. Euergetism lasted until the recipients of benefactions became the poor, and the church took the place of the community of citizens. This does not mean that reciprocity disappeared; there are as many continuities in the process of the disappearance of euergetism as in the history of its origins. But the reciprocity visible at the end of the process is a different one, which did not take the form of gift-exchange.

Bibliography

Adcock, F. and D. J. Mosley. 1975. *Diplomacy in Ancient Greece*. London.

Adkins, A. W. H. 1985. *Poetic Craft in the Early Greek Elegists*. Chicago and London.

Agócs, P., C. Carey, and R. Rawles (eds.). 2012. *Reading the Victory Ode*. Cambridge.

Ajootian, A. 1996. "Praxiteles," in Palagia and Pollitt (eds.), 91–129.

Allan, W. and D. L. Cairns. 2011. "Conflict and Community in the Iliad," in Fisher and van Wees (eds.), 113–46.

Aloni, A. 2012. "Epinician and the Polis," *BICS*, 55: 21–37.

Amandry, P. 1957. "A propos de Polyclète: Statues d'olympioniques et carrière de sculpteurs," in K. Schauenburg (ed.), *Charites. Studien zur Altertumswissenschaft*. Bonn: 63–87.

1961. "Athènes au lendemain des guerres médiques," *RUB*: 198–223.

Ameling, W. 1985. "Plutarch, Perikles 12–14," *Historia*, 34: 47–63.

Andreau, J., P. Schmitt, and A. Schnapp. 1978. "Paul Veyne et l'évergétisme," *Annales (ESC)*, 33: 307–25.

Andrewes, W. 1992. "The Spartan Resurgence," in Lewis et al. (eds.), 464–98.

Angeli Bernardini, P. 1992. "La storia dell'epinicio: aspetti socio-economici," *SIFC*, 10: 965–79.

Apostolakis, K. 2006. "The Rhetoric of an Antidosis: [D.] 42 Against Phaenippus," *Ariadne*, 12: 93–112.

Arnheim, M. T. W. 1977. *Aristocracy in Greek Society*. London.

Athanassaki, L. and E. Bowie (eds.). 2011. *Archaic and Classical Choral Song. Performance, Politics and Dissemination*. Berlin and New York.

Athanassakis, A. N. 1983 (ed. and tr.). *Hesiod. Theogony, Works and Days, Shield. Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. Baltimore and London.

Austin, M. M. 2006^{2}. *The Hellenistic World from Alexander to the Roman Conquest*. Cambridge.

and P. Vidal-Naquet. 1972. *Économies et sociétés en Grèce ancienne (périodes archaïque et classique)*. Paris.

Azoulay, V. 2014a. *Pericles of Athens*. Princeton.

2014b. *Les tyrannicides d'Athènes. Vie et mort de deux statues*. Paris.

and P. Ismard (eds.). 2011. *Clisthène et Lycurgue d'Athènes. Autour du politique dans la cité classique*. Paris.

Baba, K. 1984. "On Kerameikos Inv. I 388 (SEG XXII, 79). A Note on the Formation of the Athenian Metic-Status," *ABSA*, 79: 1–5.
Balot, R. K. 2006. *Greek Political Thought*. Malden, MA and Oxford.
Barceló, P. A. 1993. *Basileia, Monarchia, Tyrannis. Untersuchungen zu Entwicklung und Beurteilung von Alleinherrschaft im vorhellenistischen Griechenland*. Stuttgart.
Barfield, T. (ed.). 1997. *The Dictionary of Anthropology*. Oxford and Malden, MA.
Barnard, A. J. and J. Spencer (eds.). 2010². *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Social and Cultural Anthropology*. London and New York.
Barnes, J. 2001². *Early Greek Philosophy*. London.
Barringer, J. D. and J. M. Hurwit (eds.). 2005. *Periklean Athens and Its Legacy. Problems and Perspectives*. Austin.
Barron, J. P. 1984. "Ibycus: Gorgias and Other Poems," *BICS*, 31: 13–24.
Bartels, J. 2008. *Städtische Eliten im römischen Makedonien. Untersuchungen zur Formierung und Struktur*. Berlin and New York.
Baslez, M.-F. 1984. *L'Étranger dans la Grèce antique*. Paris.
Bayliss, A. J. 2011. *After Demosthenes. The Politics of Early Hellenistic Athens*. London and New York.
Beck, H. (ed.). 2013. *A Companion to Ancient Greek Government*. Malden, MA and Oxford.
Beck, M. 2007. "The Story of Damon and the Ideology of Euergetism in the *Lives of Cimon and Lucullus*," *Hermathena* 182: 53–69.
Beekes, R. S. P. 2010. *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*. Leiden.
Beloch, J. 1884. *Die attische Politik seit Perikles*. Leipzig.
Bengtson, H. 1979. *Zu den strategischen Konzeptionen des Alkibiades*. Munich.
1983. *Griechische Staatsmänner des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr*. Munich.
Berkey, D. L. 2010. "Why Fortifications Endure. A Case Study of the Walls of Athens during the Classical Period," in Hanson (ed.), 58–92.
Bernardini, P. A. 1977. "Ancora sull'iscrizione agonistica di Kleomrotos," *QUCC*, 26: 149–54.
Bertelli, L. 2014. "The Ratio of Gift-Giving in the Homeric Poems," in Carlà and Gori (eds.), 103–34.
Bertrand, J.-M. 1992. *Inscriptions historiques grecques*. Paris.
Berve, H. 1967. *Die Tyrannis bei den Griechen*. Munich.
Billows, R. A. 1995. *Kings and Colonists. Aspects of Macedonian Imperialism*. Leiden.
Blamire, A. 2001. "Athenian Finance, 454–404 B.C.," *Hesperia*, 70: 99–126.
Blank, T. 2014. "Philosophy as *Leitourgia*. Sophists, Fees, and the Civic Role of *paideia*," in Carlà and Gori (eds.), 377–402.
Blech, M. 1982. *Studien zum Kranz bei den Griechen*. Berlin and New York.
Bleckmann, B. 1998. *Athens Weg in die Niederlage. Die letzten Jahre des Peloponnesischen Krieges*. Stuttgart and Leipzig.
Bleicken, J. 1985. *Die athenische Demokratie*. Paderborn.
Bloch, H. 1953. "The Exegetes of Athens and the Prytaneion Decree," *AJPh*, 74: 407–18.
Bloedow, E. 1973. *Alcibiades Reexamined*. Wiesbaden.

Blok, J. H. 2000. "Phye's Procession: Culture, Politics and Peisistratid Rule," in Sancisi-Weerdenburg (ed.), 17–48.
2015. "The *diôbelia*: On the Political Economy of an Athenian State Fund," *ZPE*, 193: 87–102.
F. van den Eijnde, and R. Strootman (eds.) [forthcoming]. *Feasting and Polis Institutions*. Leiden.
Blösel, W. 2004. *Themistokles bei Herodot: Spiegel Athens im fünften Jahrhundert. Studien zur Geschichte und historiographischen Konstruktion des griechischen Freiheitskampfes 480 v. Chr*. Stuttgart.
Boardman, J., I. E. S. Edwards, E. Sollberger, and N. G. L. Hammond (eds.). 1992[2]. *The Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. 3, part 2. Cambridge.
Böckh, A. 1886. *Die Staatshaushaltung der Athener*. Berlin.
Boedecker, D. and K. Raaflaub (eds.). 1998. *Democracy, Empire, and the Arts in Fifth-Century Athens*. Cambridge, MA.
Boersma, J. S. 1970. *Athenian Building Policy from 561/0 to 405/4 B. C*. Groningen.
2000. "Peisistratos' Building Activity Reconsidered," in Sancisi-Weerdenburg (ed.), 49–56.
Bohringer, F. 1979. "Cultes d'athlètes en Grèce classique: propos politiques, discours mythique," *REA*, 81: 5–18.
Bol, P. C. et al. 2004. *Die Geschichte der antiken Bildhauerkunst. II. Klassische Plastik*. Mainz.
Bolkestein, H. 1939. *Wohltätigkeit und Armenpflege im vorchristlichen Altertum*. Utrecht.
Bona Quaglia, L. 1973. *Gli "Erga" di Esiodo*. Turin.
Bookidis, N. and R. S. Stroud. 2004. "Apollo and the Archaic Temple at Corinth," *Hesperia*, 73: 401–26.
Boulanger, A. 1923. Aelius Aristide et la sophistique dans la province d'Asie au II[e] siècle de notre ère. Paris.
Bourdieu, P. 1972. *Esquisse d'une théorie de la pratique*. Geneva and Paris.
1990. *The Logic of Practice*. Stanford.
1997. "Marginalia – Some Additional Notes on the Gift," in Schrift (ed.), 231–41.
Bousquet, J. 1986. "Lettre de Ptolémée Evergète à Xanthos de Lycie," *REG*, 99: 22–32.
Bouvrie, S. des (ed.). 2004. *Myth and Symbol II. Symbolic Phenomena in Ancient Greek Culture*. Bergen.
2004. "Olympia and the Epinikion. A Creation of Symbols," in Bouvrie (ed.), 353–91.
Bowra, C. M. 1938. "Xenophanes and the Olympic Games," *AJPh*, 59: 257–79.
1960. "Euripides" Epinician for Alcibiades," *Historia*, 9: 68–79.
1964. *Pindar*. Oxford.
Braccesi, L. 1978: "Le tirannidi e gli sviluppi politici ed economico sociali," in Pugliese Carratelli et al., 329–82.
Brandt, H. 1989. "*Gês anadasmos* und ältere Tyrannis," *Chiron*, 19: 207–20.

Brandt, J. R. and J. W. Iddeng. 2012. *Greek & Roman Festivals. Content Meaning & Practice*. Oxford.

Brenne, S. 2001. *Ostrakismos und Prominenz in Athen. Attische Bürger des 5 Jhs. v. Chr. auf den Ostraka*. Vienna.

Briant, P. 2002. *From Cyrus to Alexander. A History of the Persian Empire*. Winona Lake, IN.

Bringmann, K. 2000. *Schenkungen hellenistischer Herrscher an griechische Städte und Heiligtümer. Teil II/1. Geben und Nehmen. Monarchische Wohltätigkeit und Selbstdarstellung im Zeitalter des Hellenismus. Mit einem numismatischen Beitrag von H.-C. Noeske*. Berlin.

2005. "Königliche Ökonomie im Spiegel des Euergetismus der Seleukiden," *Klio*, 87: 102–15.

and H. von Steuben (eds.). 1995. *Schenkungen hellenistischer Herrscher an griechische Städte und Heiligtümer. Teil I. Zeugnisse und Kommentare*. Berlin.

Brown, P. 2013. "From Civic Euergetism to Christian Giving. The Parameters of Change," in P. Eich and E. Faber (eds.), *Religiöser Alltag in der Spätantike*. Stuttgart: 23–30.

Brun, P. 1983. *Eisphora – Syntaxis – Stratiotika. Recherches sur les finances militaires d'Athènes au IVe siècle av. J.-C*. Paris.

2000. *L'orateur Démade. Essai d'histoire et d'historiographie*. Bordeaux.

Brunt, P. 1966. "Athenian Settlements Abroad in the Fifth Century B.C.," in E. Badian (ed.), *Ancient Society and Institutions. Studies Presented to V. Ehrenberg*. Oxford: 71–92.

Buhmann, H. 1975[2]. *Der Sieg in Olympia und in den anderen panhellenischen Spielen*. Munich.

Bumke, H. 2004. *Statuarische Gruppen in der frühen griechischen Kunst*. Berlin.

Burckhardt, L. A. 1996. *Bürger und Soldaten. Aspekte der politischen und militärischen Rolle athenischer Bürger im Kriegswesen des 4. Jh. v. Chr*. Stuttgart.

2000. "Eine Demokratie wohl, aber kein Rechtsstaat? Der Arginusenprozess des Jahres 406 v. Chr.," in Burckhardt and von Ungern-Sternberg (eds.), 128–43.

and J. von Ungern-Sternberg (eds.). *Grosse Prozesse im antiken Athen*. Munich.

Burnett, A. P. and C. N. Edmonson. 1961. "The Chabrias Monument in the Athenian Agora," *Hesperia*, 30: 74–91.

Burrer, F. and H. Müller (eds.). 2008. *Kriegskosten und Kriegsfinanzierung in der Antike*. Darmstadt.

Burtt, J. O. 1954. *Minor Attic Orators. Lycurgus. Dinarchus. Demades. Hyperides*. Cambridge, MA, and London.

Busolt, G. 1920–1926. *Griechische Staatskunde*. Munich.

Calabi Limentani, I. 1985. "Vittime dell' oligarchia. A proposito del decreto di Teozotide," in *Studi in onore di C. Sanfilippo* 6. Milan: 115–28.

Camp, J. M. 1986. *The Athenian Agora. Excavations in the Heart of Classical Athens*. London.

2001. *The Archaeology of Athens*. New Haven.

Canevaro, M. 2013. *The Documents in the Attic Orators. Laws and Decrees in the Public Speeches of the Demosthenic Corpus*. Oxford.
and E. M. Harris. 2012. "The Documents in Andocides' On the Mysteries," *CQ*, 62: 98–129.
Capdetrey, L. and Y. Lafond (eds.). 2010. *La cité et ces élites. Pratiques et représentation des formes de domination et de contrôle social dans les cités grecques*. Bordeaux.
Carawan, E. 2013. *The Athenian Amnesty and Reconstructing the Law*. Oxford.
Carey, C. 1994. Review of Kurke 1991, *JHS* 114: 184.
1996. "Pindar," in *OCD*: 1183–4.
2007. "Pindar, Place and Performance," in Hornblower and Morgan (eds.), 199–210.
Carlà, F. and M. Gori. 2014. *Gift Giving and the "Embedded" Economy in the Ancient World*. Heidelberg.
Carlsson, S. 2010. *Hellenistic Democracies. Freedom, Independence and Political Procedure in Some East Greek City-States*. Stuttgart.
Cartledge, P. 1999. *Democritus*. New York.
Carty, A. 2015. *Polycrates, Tyrant of Samos. New Light on Archaic Greece*. Stuttgart.
Cassanmagnago, C. (ed.). 2009. Esiodo. *Tutte le opere e i frammenti con la prima traduzione degli scolii*. Milan.
Castriota, D. 1992. *Myth, Ethos and Actuality. Official Art in Fifth-Century B.C. Athens*. Madison and London.
Cébeillac-Gervasoni, M. and L. Lamoine (eds.). 2003. *Les élites et leurs facettes. Les élites locales dans le monde hellénistique et romain*. Rome and Clermont-Ferrand.
Cecchet, L. 2014. "Giving to the Poor in Ancient Greece. A Form of Social Aid?," in Carlà and Gori (eds.), 157–79.
Chambers, M. H. 1984. "The Formation of the Tyranny of Pisistratus," in J. Harmatta (ed.), *Proceedings of the VIIth Congress of the International Federation of the Societies of Classical Studies*, Budapest: vol. 1, 69–72.
Chaniotis, A. 2013. "Public Subscriptions and Loans as Social Capital in the Hellenistic City: Reciprocity, Performance, Commemoration," in Martzavou and Papazarkadas (eds.), 89–106.
Chantraine, P. 1968. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. Histoire des mots*. Paris.
Chevallier, R. 1978. "Review of Veyne 1976," *Latomus*, 37: 226–31.
Childs, W. A. P. 1994. "The Date of the Old Temple of Athena on the Athenian Acropolis," in Coulson et al. (eds.), 1–6.
Christ, M. 1990. "Liturgy Avoidance and Antidosis in Classical Athens," *TAPhA*, 120: 147–69.
2006. *The Bad Citizen in Classical Athens*. Cambridge.
2012. *The Limits of Altruism in Democratic Athens*. Cambridge.
Cohen, E. 1992. *Athenian Economy and Society. A Banking Perspective*. Princeton.

Colpaert, S. 2014. "Euergetism and the Gift," in Carlà and Gori (eds.), 181–201.
Connelly, J. B. 2014. *The Parthenon Enigma*. New York.
Connor, W. R. 1968. *Theopompus and Fifth-Century Athens*. Washington.
1971. *The New Politicians of Fifth-Century Athens*. Princeton.
Constantakopoulou, C. 2007. *The Dance of the Islands. Insularity, Networks, the Athenian Empire, and the Aegean World*. Oxford.
Conwell, D. H. 2008. *Connecting a City to the Sea. The History of the Athenian Long Walls*. Leiden.
Cornelius, F. 1929. *Die Tyrannis in Athen*. Munich.
Coulson, W. D. E. et al. (eds.) 1994. *The Archaeology of Athens and Attica under the Democracy*. Oxford.
Cracco Ruggini, L. 2014. "From Pagan to Christian Euergetism," in Carlà and Gori (eds.), 203–12.
Crielaard, J. P. 2009. "Cities," in Raaflaub and van Wees (eds.), 347–72.
Cuniberti, G. 2011. "Le partecipazioni occidentali ai Giochi olimpici e il valore dell' hesychia tra intenti di pace e di conflitto," *Hormos*, n.s. 3: 274–86.
Currie, B. 2002. "Euthymos of Locri: A Case Study in Heroization in the Classical Period," *JHS*, 122: 24–44.
2004. "Reperformance Scenarios for Pindar's Odes," in Mackie, 49–69.
2011. "Epinician Choregia: Funding a Pindaric Chorus," in Athanassaki and Bowie (eds.), 269–310.
Curty, O. (ed.). 2009. *L'huile et l'argent. Gymnasiarchie et évergétisme dans la Grèce hellénistique*. Fribourg.
Daly, K. F. 2007. "Two Inscriptions from the Athenian Agora: I 7571 and I 7579," *Hesperia*, 76: 539–54.
Daverio-Rocchi, G. 1978. "Transformations de rôle dans les institutions d'Athènes au IV^{e} siècle par rapport aux changements dans la société," *DHA*, 4: 33–50.
Davies, J. K. 1971. *Athenian Propertied Families, 600–300 B.C.* Oxford.
1981. *Wealth and the Power of Wealth in Classical Athens*. New York.
1992. "Greece after the Persian Wars," in Lewis et al. (eds.), 15–33.
1993^{2}. *Democracy and Classical Greece*. Cambridge, MA.
Davison, C. C. 2009. *Pheidias. The Sculptures and Ancient Sources (= BICS Suppl. 105)*, vols. 1–3. London.
De Libero, L. 1996. *Die archaische Tyrannis*. Stuttgart.
De Polignac, F. and P. Schmitt Pantel (eds.). 1998. *Public et privé en Grèce ancienne: lieux, conduites, pratiques* (= Ktèma, 23*)*. Strasbourg.
De Romilly, J. 1995. *Alcibiade ou les dangers de l'ambition*. Paris.
De Ste, Croix, G. E. M. 1981. *The Class Struggle in the Ancient Greek World. From the Archaic Age to the Arab Conquests*. London.
Decker, W. 2001. "Siegerstatuen," in Cancik and Schneider (eds.), *Der Neue Pauly*, vol. 11: cols. 534–5.
Deene, M. 2011. "Naturalized Citizens and Social Mobility in Classical Athens: The Case of Apollodorus," *Greece & Rome*, 58: 159–75.

2012. "Proleptic Honours in Classical Athens? A Short Note on IG II^2 212," *ZPE*, 183: 171–5.
Denlaux, E. 2008. "Travaux publics et évergétisme en Albanie à l'époque romaine," in C. Berrendonner, M. Cébeillac-Gervasoni, and L. Lamoine (eds.), *Le quotidien municipale dans l'Occident Romain*. Paris: 431–44.
Derderian, K. 2001. *Leaving Words to Remember. Greek Mourning & the Advent of Literacy*. Leiden.
Derrida, J. 1992. *Given Time: I. Counterfeit Money*. Chicago.
Despinis, G. 2001. "Vermutungen zum Marathon-Weihgeschenk der Athener in Delphi," *JDAI*, 116: 103–23.
Diels, H. and W. Kranz (eds.). 1951–1952^6. *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*. Berlin.
Dillon, S. 2006. *Ancient Greek Portrait Sculpture. Contexts, Subjects, and Styles*. Cambridge.
Dmitriev, S. 2005. *City Government in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor*. Oxford.
Domingo Gygax, M. 2001. *Untersuchungen zu den lykischen Gemeinwesen in klassischer und hellenistischer Zeit*. Bonn.
2002. "Peisistratos und Kimon: Anmerkung zu einem Vergleich bei Athenaios," *Hermes*, 130, 245–9.
2003. "Euergetismus und Gabentausch," *Mètis*, N.S. 1: 181–200.
2006a. "Les origines de l'évergétisme. Échanges et identités sociales dans la cité grecque," *Mètis*, N.S. 4, 269–95.
2006b. "Plutarch on Alcibiades' Return to Athens," *Mnemosyne*, 59, 481–500.
2006c. "Contradictions et asymétrie dans l'évergétisme grec: bienfaiteurs étrangers et citoyens entre image et réalité," *DHA*, 32: 9–23.
2007. "El intercambio de dones en el mundo griego: reciprocidad, imprecisión, equivalencia y desequilibrio," *Gerión*, 25: 111–26.
2009. "Proleptic Honours in Greek Euergetism," *Chiron*, 39: 163–91.
2013. "Gift-Giving and Power Relationships in Greek Social Praxis and Public Discourse," in Satlow (ed.), 45–60.
(forthcoming). "Redistribution and Its Limits. Responding to Financial Challenges in Fourth-Century Athens," in Pascual, Antela-Bernárdez, and Gómez Castro (eds.) [forthcoming]: 29–40.
Donlan, W. 1973. "The Tradition of Anti-Aristocratic Thought in Early Greek Poetry," *Historia*, 22: 145–54.
1980. *The Aristocratic Ideal in Ancient Greece. Attitudes of Superiority from Homer to the End of the Fifth Century B. C*. Lawrence.
1981/82. "Reciprocities in Homer," *CW*, 75: 137–75.
1989. "The Unequal Exchange between Glaucus and Diomedes in Light of the Homeric Gift-Economy," *Phoenix*, 43: 1–15.
1997. "The Relations of Power in the Pre-State and Early State Polities," in Mitchell and Rhodes (eds.), 21–5.
Dörtlük, K. et al. (eds.). 2006. *Symposium Proceedings. The IIIrd Symposium on Lycia*. Antalya.
Dow, S. 1937. *Prytaneis. A Study of the Inscriptions Honoring the Athenian Councillors (= Hesperia Suppl. 1)*. Athens.

1976. "Companionable Associates in the Athenian Government," in L. Bonfante and H. von Heintze (eds.), *In Memoriam Otto J. Brendel. Essays in Archaeology and Humanities*. Mainz: 69–84.
Dreyer, B. and P. F. Mittag (eds.). 2011. *Lokale Eliten und hellenistische Könige. Zwischen Kooperation und Konfrontation*. Berlin.
Dubois, L. 2002. *Inscriptions grecques dialectales de Grande Grèce. Tome II. Colonies achéennes*. Geneva.
Dunbar, N. (ed.). 1995. *Aristophanes. Birds*. Oxford.
Duplouy, A. 2002. "L'aristocratie et la circulation des richesses. Apport de l'histoire économique à la définition des élites grecques," *RBPh*, 80: 5–24.
2006. *Le Prestige des Élites. Recherches sur les modes de reconnaissance sociale en Grèce entre les Xe et Ve siècles avant J.-C*. Paris.
Dyggve, E. 1960. *Lindos. Fouilles de l'acropole 1902–1914 et 1952. III. Le sanctuaire d'Athena Lindia et l'architecture lindienne*. Berlin.
Ebert, J. 1972. *Griechische Epigramme auf Sieger in gymnischen und hippischen Agonen*. Berlin.
Eckerman, C. 2010. "The Kômos of Pindar and Bacchylides and the Semantics of Celebration," *CQ*, 60: 302–12.
Eder, W. (ed.). 1995. *Die athenische Demokratie im 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr. Vollendung oder Verfall einer Verfassungsform?* Stuttgart.
Edwards, A. T. 2004. *Hesiod's Ascra*. Berkeley.
Egetmeyer, M. 2010. *Le dialecte grec ancien de Chypre*. Berlin and New York.
Ehrenberg, V. 1937. "When Did the Polis Rise?" *JHS*, 57: 147–59.
1954. *Sophocles and Pericles*. Oxford.
1957–1958. *Der Staat der Griechen*. Leipzig.
2011[3]. *From Solon to Socrates*. Greek History and Civilisation during the 6th and 5th Centuries B.C. London.
Ellis, W. 1989. *Alcibiades*. London and New York.
Ellis-Evans, A. 2013. "The Ideology of Public Subscriptions," in Martzavou and Papazarkadas, 107–22.
Elster, J. 1983. *Sour Grapes. Studies in the Subversion of Rationality*. Cambridge.
Engelmann, H. 1976. *Die Inschriften von Kyme*. Bonn.
Engels, J. 1998. *Funerum sepulcrorumque magnificentia. Begräbnis- und Grabluxusgesetze in der griechisch-römischen Welt mit einigen Ausblicken auf Einschränkungen des funeralen und sepulkralen Luxus im Mittelalter und in der Neuzeit*. Stuttgart.
2008. *Lykurg. Rede gegen Leokrates*. Darmstadt.
Engen, D. T. 2010. *Honor and Profit. Athenian Trade Policy and the Economy and Society of Greece, 415–307 B.C.E*. Ann Arbor.
Ercolani, A. (ed.). 2010. *Esiodo. Opere e giorni. Introduzione, traduzione e commento*. Rome.
Erxleben, E. 1975. "Die Kleruchien auf Euböa und Lesbos und die Methoden der attischen Herrschaft im 5 Jh.," *Klio*, 57: 83–100.
Evelyn-White, H. G. (ed.). 1914. *Hesiod. The Homeric Hymns and Homerica*. London and New York.

Fantuzzi, M. 2011. "Hector between *Xenia* and *Symmachia* for Rhesos (on [Eur.] Rhesus 264–453)," in Peigney (ed.), 121–36.
Faraguna, M. 1992. *Atene nell'età di Alessandro. Problemi politici, economici, finanziari*. Roma.
1999. Review of de Libero 1996, *Athenaeum*, 87: 576–80.
2011. "Lykourgan Athens?" in Azoulay and Ismard (eds.), 67–86.
Fatheuer, T. 1988: *Ehre und Gerechtigkeit. Studien zur gesellschaftlichen Ordnung im frühen Griechenland*. Diss. Münster.
Figueira, T. J. 1983–1984. "Aeginetan Independence," *CJ*, 79: 8–29.
1985. "Herodotus on the Early Hostilities between Aegina and Athens," *AJPh*, 106: 49–74.
2008. "Colonisation in the Classical Period," in Tsetskhladze (ed.), vol. 2: 427–523.
2011. "The Athenian Naukraroi and Archaic Naval Warfare," *Cadmo*, 21: 183–210.
Finkelberg, M. (ed.). 2011. *The Homer Encyclopedia*. Chichester and Malden, MA.
Finley, M. I. 1973. *The Ancient Economy*. Berkeley and Los Angeles.
1978[3]. *The World of Odysseus*. New York.
and H. W. Pleket. 1976. *The Olympic Games: The First Thousand Years*. London.
Fisher, N. 2000. "Hybris, Revenge and Stasis in the Greek City-States," in van Wees (ed.), 83–123.
2009. "The Culture of Competition" in Raaflaub and van Wees (eds.), 524–41.
2010. "*Kharis, Kharites*, Festivals, and Social Peace in the Classical Greek City," in Rosen and Sluiter (eds.), 71–112.
and H. van Wees (eds.). 1998. *Archaic Greece: New Approaches and New Evidence*. London and Swansea.
and H. van Wees (eds.). 2011. *Competition in the Ancient World*. Swansea.
Flower, M. A. 1994. *Theopompus of Chios. History and Rhetoric in the Fourth Century B.C.* Oxford and New York.
Fornara, C. W. 1968. "The 'Tradition' about the Murder of Hipparchus," *Historia*, 17: 400–424.
1983[2]. *Archaic Times to the End of the Peloponnesian War*. Baltimore and London.
Forsdyke, S. 2005. *Exile, Ostracism, and Democracy. The Politics of Expulsion in Ancient Greece*. Princeton.
Foxhall, L., H.-J. Gehrke, and N. Luraghi (eds.). 2010. *Intentional History. Spinning Time in Ancient Greece*. Stuttgart
Franciosi, V. 2010. "Una statua di Artemide Brauronia dall'Acropoli pisistratea," *Annali dell' Università degli Studi Suor Orsola Benincasa*: 139–73.
Freeman, K. 1926. *The Work and Life of Solon, with a Translation of his Poems*. Cardiff.
French, A. 1964. *The Growth of the Athenian Economy*. London.
1991. "Economic Conditions in Fourth-Century Athens", *Greece & Rome*, 38: 24–40.

Freyer-Schauenburg, B. 1974. *Samos XI. Bildwerke der archaischen Zeit und des strengen Stils*. Bonn.
Frisk, H. 1960–1972. *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg.
Frösén, J. (ed.). 1997. *Early Hellenistic Athens. Symptoms of a Change*. Helsinki.
Frost, F. J. 1998[2]. *Plutarch's Themistocles. A Historical Commentary*. Chicago.
Furley, W. D. 1996. *Andokides and the Herms. A Study of Crisis in Fifth-Century Athenian Religion (=BICS Suppl. 65)*. London.
Furtwängler, A. 1880. "Statue von der Akropolis," *MDAI (A)*, 5: 20–42.
Gabrielsen, V. 1985. "The Naukrariai and the Athenian Navy," *C&M*, 36: 21–51.
1986. "*Phanera* and *Aphanês Ousia* in Classical Athens," *C&M*, 37: 99–114.
1987. "The Antidosis Procedure in Classical Athens," *C&M*, 38: 7–38.
1994. *Financing the Athenian Fleet. Public Taxation and Social Relations*. Baltimore and London.
Gadbery, L. M. 1992. "The Sanctuary of the Twelve Gods in the Athenian Agora: A Revised View," *Hesperia*, 61: 447–89.
Gagarin, M. 2008. *Writing Greek Law*. Cambridge.
and D. M. MacDowell (trans.). 1998. *Antiphon & Andocides*. Austin.
and P. Woodruff. 1995. *Early Greek Political Thought from Homer to the Sophists*. Cambridge.
Gardiner, E. N. 1910. *Greek Athletic Sports and Festivals*. London.
Garnsey, P. 1988. *Famine and Food Supply in the Graeco-Roman World: Responses to Risk and Crisis*. Cambridge and New York.
Gauer, W. 1968. "Die griechischen Bildnisse der klassischen Zeit als politische und persönliche Denkmäler," *JDAI*, 83: 118–79.
Gauthier, P. 1972. *Symbola. Les étrangers et la justice dans les cités grecques*. Nancy.
1976. *Un commentaire historique des Poroi de Xénophon*. Geneva and Paris.
1985. *Les cités grecques et leurs bienfaiteurs*. Athens and Paris.
Gehrke, H.-J. 1986. *Jenseits von Athen und Sparta. Das Dritte Griechenland und seine Staatenwelt*. Munich.
1990. "Herodot und die Tyrannenchronologie," in W. Ax (ed.), *Memoria rerum veterum. Festschrift für C.-J. Classen zum 60. Geburtstag*. Stuttgart: 33–49.
1993. "Konflikt und Gesetz. Überlegungen zur frühen Polis," in J. Bleicken (ed.), *Colloquium aus Anlass des 80. Geburtstages von Alfred Heuss*. Kallmünz: 49–67.
2009. "States," in Raaflaub and van Wees (eds.), 395–410.
Gelzer, T. 1985. "Mousa authigenês: Bemerkungen zu einem Typ Pindarischer und Bacchylideischer Epinikien," *MH*, 42: 95–120.
Gernet, L. 1957. *Démosthène. Plaidoyers civils*, vol. 2. Paris.
1968. *Anthropologie de la Grèce antique*. Paris.
and M. Bizos (eds.). 1955. *Lysias. Discours*. Paris.
Geske, N. 2005. *Nikias und das Volk von Athen im Archidamischen Krieg*. Stuttgart.
Gill, C. N. Postlethwaite, and R. Seaford (eds.). 1998. *Reciprocity in Ancient Greece*. Oxford.
Giovannini, A. 1990. "Le Parthénon, le trésor d'Athéna et le tribut des alliés," *Historia*, 39: 129–48.

1997. "La participation des alliés au financement du Parthénon: *aparchè* ou tribut?," *Historia*, 46: 145–57.
Giraudeau, M. 1984. *Les notions juridiques et sociales chez Hérodote. Études sur le vocabulaire*. Paris.
Godelier, M. 1986. *The Making of Great Men. Male Domination and Power among the New Guinea Baruya*. Cambridge.
1999. *The Enigma of the Gift*. Cambridge.
and M. Strathern (eds.). 1991. *Big Men and Great Men. Personifications of Power in Melanesia*. Cambridge.
Goffin, B. 2002. *Euergetismus in Oberitalien*. Bonn.
Golden, M. 1998. *Sport and Society in Ancient Greece*. Cambridge.
Goligher, W. A. 1907. "Studies in Attic Law II. The Antidosis," *Hermathena*, 14: 481–515.
Gottlieb, G. 1963. *Das Verhältnis der außerherodoteischen Überlieferung zu Herodot. Untersucht an historischen Stoffen aus der griechischen Geschichte*. Bonn.
Gouldner, A. W. 1960. "The Norm of Reciprocity: A Preliminary Statement," *American Sociological Review*, 25: 161–78.
Grätz, S. 2004. "Esra 7 im Kontext hellenistischer Politik. Der königliche Euergetismus in hellenistischer Zeit als ideeller Hintergrund vor Esr 7, 12–26," in S. Alkier and M. Witte (eds.), *Die Griechen und das antike Israel*. Fribourg-Göttingen: 131–54.
Graziosi, B. and J. Haubold (eds.). 2010. *Homer. Iliad, Book VI*. Cambridge.
Grieb, V. 2008. *Hellenistische Demokratie. Politische Organisation und Struktur in freien griechischen Poleis nach Alexander dem Grossen*. Stuttgart.
Griffin, A. 1982. *Sikyon*. Oxford.
Gross, W. H. 1969–1971. "Quas iconicas vocant. Zum Porträtcharakter der Statuen dreimaliger olympischer Sieger," *NAWG*, 3: 61–76.
Gruben, G. 1982. "Naxos und Paros. Vierter vorläufiger Bericht über die Forschungskampagnen 1972–1980," *AA*: 159–95.
1997. "Naxos und Delos. Studien zur archaischen Architektur der Kykladen," *JDAI*, 112: 261–416.
2001[5]. *Griechische Tempel und Heiligtümer*. Munich
Gruen, E. S. 1993. "The Polis in the Hellenistic World," in R. M. Rosen and J. Farrell (eds.), Nomodeiktes. *Greek Studies in Honor of Martin Ostwald*. Ann Arbor: 339–54.
Gschnitzer, F. 1973. "Proxenos," *Paulys Realencyclopädie*, suppl. 13: cols. 629–730.
1981. *Griechische Sozialgeschichte. Von der mykenischen bis zum Ausgang der klassischen Zeit*. Wiesbaden.
Guarducci, M. 1967–1978. *Epigrafia greca*, vols. 1–4. Rome.
Gwatkin, W. E. 1957: "The Legal Arguments in Aeschines' *Against Ktesiphon* and Demosthenes' *On the Crown*," *Hesperia*, 26: 129–41.
Haarer, P. 2013. "Kypselos," in R. S. Bagnall et al. (eds.), *The Encyclopedia of Ancient History*: 3843–5.
Habicht, C. 1961. "Falsche Urkunden zur Geschichte Athens im Zeitalter der Perserkriege," *Hermes*, 89: 1–35.

1970². *Gottmenschentum und griechische Städte*. Munich.
1988. *Hellenistic Athens and her Philosophers*. Princeton.
1989. "Pytheas von Alopeke, Aufseher über die Brunnen Attikas," *ZPE*, 77: 83–7.
1997. *Athens from Alexander to Antony*. Cambridge, MA.
1998². *Pausanias' Guide to Ancient Greece*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London.
Hakkarainen, M. 1997. "Private Wealth in the Athenian Public Sphere during the Late Classical and the Early Hellenistic Period," in Frösén (ed.), 1–32.
Hall, J. 2007a. "Politics and Greek Myth," in Woodard (ed.), 331–54.
2007b. "Polis, Community, and Ethnic Identity," in Shapiro (ed.), 40–60.
2014². *A History of the Archaic Greek World, ca. 1200–479 BCE*. Malden, MA.
Hamilton, R., E. Rainis, and R. Ruttenberg (eds.). 1988. *Hesiod's Works and Days*. Bryn Mawr.
Hamon, P. 2012. "Gleichheit, Ungleichheit und Euergetismus: die *isotes* in den kleinasiatischen Poleis," in Mann and Scholz (eds.), 56–73.
Hands, A. R. 1968. *Charities and Social Aid in Greece and Rome*. Ithaca.
Hanink, J. 2014. *Lycurgan Athens and the Making of Classical Tragedy*. Cambridge.
Hanson, V. D. (ed.). 2010. *Makers of Ancient Strategy. From the Persian Wars to the Fall of Rome*. Princeton.
Harding, P. 1985. *From the End of the Peloponnesian War to the Battle of Ipsus*. Cambridge.
Harris, E. M. 1994: "Law and Oratory," in Worthington (ed.), 130–50.
2000. "Open Texture in Athenian Law," *Dike*, 3: 27–79.
(trans.). 2008. *Demosthenes. Speeches 20–22*. Austin.
2013. "Andocides," in R. S. Bagnall et al. (eds.), *The Encyclopedia of Ancient History*: 413–14.
Harrison, A. R. W. 1968. *The Law of Athens. The Family and Property*. Oxford.
Hatzfeld, J. 1951. *Alcibiade. Étude sur l'histoire d'Athènes à la fin du Ve siècle*. Paris.
Hausmann, U. 1977. *Der Tübinger Waffenläufer*. Tübingen.
Hawhee, D. 2004. *Bodily Arts. Rhetoric and Athletics in Ancient Greece*. Austin.
Hays, H. M. 1918. *Notes on the Works and Days of Hesiod*. Diss. Chicago.
Heath, M. and M. R. Lefkowitz. 1991. "Epinician Performance," *CPh*, 86: 173–91.
Hedrick, C. W. 1988: "An Honorific Phratry Inscription," *AJPh* 109: 111–17.
Heftner, H. 2011. *Alkibiades. Staatsmann und Feldherr*. Darmstadt.
Heinzelmann, M. 2003. "Städtekonkurrenz und kommunaler Bürgersinn. Die Säulenstraße von Perge als Beispiel monumentaler Stadtgestaltung durch kollektiven Euergetismus," *AA*: 197–220.
Heitsch, E. 1983. *Xenophanes: Die Fragmente*. Munich and Zürich.
Hellman, M.-C. 1999. *Choix d'inscriptions architecturales grecques, traduites et commentées*. Lyon.
Hénaff, M. 2010. *The Price of Truth. Gift, Money, and Philosophy*. Stanford.
2013. "Ceremonial Gift-Giving. The Lessons of Anthropology with Mauss and Beyond," in Satlow (ed.), 12–24.
Henderson, J. (ed.). 1998. *Aristophanes. Acharnians. Knights*. Cambridge, MA.
Henry, S. 1983. *Honours and Privileges in Athenian Decrees. The Principal Formulae of Athenian Honorary Decrees*. Hildesheim.

Herman, G. 1987. *Ritualised Friendship and the Greek City*. Cambridge.
1998. "Reciprocity, Altruism, and the Prisoner's Dilemma: The Special Case of Classical Athens," in Gill, Postlethwaite, and Seaford (eds.), 199–225.
2006. *Morality and Behaviour in Democratic Athens. A Social History*. Cambridge.
Herrmann, H.-V. 1972. *Olympia*. Munich.
1988. "Die Siegerstatuen von Olympia," *Nikephoros*, 1: 119–83.
Herrmann, P. 1965a. "Antiochos der Große und Teos," *Anadolu*, 9: 29–159.
1965b. "Neue Urkunden zur Geschichte von Milet im 2 Jh. v. Chr.," *MDAI (I)*, 15: 71–117.
Heskel, J. 1997. *The North Aegean Wars, 371–360 B.C.* Stuttgart.
Hignett, C. 1952. *A History of the Athenian Constitution to the End of the Fifth Century B.C.* Oxford.
Hintzen-Bohlen, B. 1997. *Die Kulturpolitik des Eubolos und des Lykurg. Die Denkmäler- und Bauprojekte in Athen zwischen 355 und 322 v. Chr.* Berlin.
Hirsch, M. 1925. "Die athenischen Tyrannenmörder in Geschichtsschreibung und Volkslegende," *Klio*, 20: 129–67.
Hoepfner, W. (ed.). 1997. *Kult und Kultbauten auf der Akropolis*. Berlin.
Hölkeskamp, K.-J. 1999. *Schiedsrichter, Gesetzgeber und Gesetzgebung im archaischen Griechenland*. Stuttgart.
Hölscher, T. 1973. *Griechische Historienbilder des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* Würzburg.
Holstein, A. 2010. "Un acte d'évergétisme à Augustodonum-Autun (Lyonnaise) à la fin du IIIe siècle," in Lamoine, Berrendonner, and Cébeillac-Gervasoni (eds.), 347–61.
Holtzmann, B. 2003. *L'Acropole d'Athènes. Monuments, cultes et histoire du sanctuaire d'Athèna Polias*. Paris.
2012. "L'Acropole d'Athènes en chantier: restaurations et études depuis 1975," *Perspective*, 2: 263–81.
Hopper, R. J. 1961. "'Plain,' 'Shore,' and 'Hill' in Early Athens," *ABSA*, 56: 189–219.
Hopwood, K. 1999. *Organised Crime in Antiquity*. London and Swansea.
Hornblower, S. 1991. *A Commentary on Thucydides*, vols. 1–2. Oxford.
2004. *Thucydides and Pindar. Historical Narrative and the World of Epinikian Poetry*. Oxford.
2012. "What Happened Later to the Families of Pindaric Patrons – and to Epinician Poetry?" in Agócs, Carey, and Rawles (eds.), 93–107.
(ed.). 2013. *Herodotus. Histories. Book V*. Cambridge.
and C. Morgan (eds.). 2007. *Pindar's Poetry, Patrons and Festivals. From Archaic Greece to the Roman Empire*. Oxford.
Hubbard, T. K. 1992. "Remaking Myth and Rewriting History: Cult Tradition in Pindar's Ninth Nemean," *HSPh*, 94: 77–111.
2001. "Pindar and Athens after the Persian Wars," in Papenfuss and Strocka (eds.), 387–400.

2008. "Contemporary Sport Sociology and Ancient Greek Athletics," *Leisure Studies*, 27: 379–93.
Humphreys, S. C. 1978. *Anthropology and the Greeks*. London and Boston.
2004. *The Strangeness of Gods. Historical Perspectives on the Interpretation of Athenian Religion*. Oxford.
Hunt, P. 2010. *War, Peace, and Alliance in Demosthenes' Athens*. Cambridge.
Hurwit, J. M. 1999. *The Athenian Acropolis. History, Mythology, and Archaeology from the Neolithic Era to the Present*. Cambridge.
2013. "Akropolis," in R. S. Bagnall et al. (eds.), *The Encyclopedia of Ancient History*: 48–52.
Hyde, W. W. 1921 *Olympic Victor Monuments and Greek Athletic Art*. Washington.
Ihnken, T. 1978. *Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Sipylos*. Bonn.
İplikçioğlu, B. 2008. "Ein neues hellenistisches Ehrendekret aus Arykanda (Lykien)," *AAWW* 143: 117–26.
Irigoin, J., J. Duchemin, and L. Bardollet (eds.). 2002². *Bacchylide. Dithyrambes. Épinicies. Fragments*. Paris.
Ismard, P. 2010. *La cité des réseaux. Athènes e ses associations VIe–Ier siècle av. J.–C.* Paris.
Jacob, R. 2014. "À propos des frontons archaïques de l'Acropole," *AC*, 83: 171–9.
Jeffery, L. H. 1990². *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece*. Oxford.
Jones, N. F. 1999. *The Associations of Classical Athens. The Response to Democracy*. New York.
2004. *Rural Athens under the Democracy*. Philadelphia.
Jordan, B. 1979. *Servants of the Gods. A Study in the Religion, History and Literature of Fifth-Century Athens*. Göttingen.
1988. "The Honors for Themistocles after Salamis," *AJPh*, 109: 547–71.
Judeich, W. 1931². *Topographie von Athen*. Munich.
Jung, M. 2006. *Marathon und Plataiai. Zwei Perserschlachten als »lieux de mémoire« im antiken Griechenland*. Göttingen.
Jüthner, J. 1924. "Lampadêdromia," *Paulys Realencyclopädie*, 12. 1: 569–77.
Kagan, D. 2003. *The Peloponnesian War*. New York.
Kahrstedt, U. 1934. *Staatsgebiet und Staatsangehörige in Athen. Studien zum öffentlichen Recht Athens*. Stuttgart and Berlin.
Kaletsch, H. 1989. "Naxos," in S. Lauffer (ed.), *Griechenland. Lexikon der historischen Stätten von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart*. Munich: 461–5.
Kallet, L. 2003. "Dêmos Tyrannos: Wealth, Power, and Economic Patronage," in Morgan (ed.), 117–53.
2007. "The Athenian Economy," in Samons (ed.), 70–95.
Kallet-Marx, L. 1989. "Did Tribute Fund the Parthenon?" *ClAnt*, 8: 252–66.
Kansteiner, S. et al. (eds.). 2007. *Text und Skulptur. Berühmte Bildhauer und Bronzegießer der Antike in Wort und Bild*. Berlin and New York.
Karakatsanis, P. 1986. *Studien zu archaischen Kolossalwerken*. Frankfurt am Main.
Keaveney, A. 2003. *The Life and Journey of Athenian Statesman Themistocles (524–460 B.C.?) as a Refugee in Persia*. Lewiston, Queenston, and Lampeter.
Keesling, C. M. 2003. *The Votive Statues of the Athenian Acropolis*. Cambridge.

2004. "The Hermolykos/Kresilas Base and the Date of Kresilas of Kydonia," *ZPE*, 147: 79–91.
Kerschner, M. and W. Prochaska. 2011. "Die Tempel und Altäre der Artemis in Ephesos und ihre Baumaterialien," *JÖAI*, 80: 73–154.
Kienast, D. 2005. "Die Funktion der attischen Demen von Solon bis Kleisthenes," *Chiron*, 35: 69–100.
Kienast, H. J. 1978. *Die Stadtmauer von Samos*. Bonn.
1992. "Topographische Studien im Heraion von Samos," *AA* 1992: 171–213.
2002. "Topography and Architecture of the Archaic Heraion at Samos," in Stamatopoulou and Yeroulanou (eds.), 317–25.
2004a. *Die Wasserleitung des Eupalinos auf Samos*. Bonn.
2004b. "Die Tyrannis inszeniert sich: Großbauten auf der Insel Samos," in Schwandner and Rheidt (eds.), 69–78.
Kinzl, K. H. (ed.). 1979. *Die ältere Tyrannis bis zu den Perserkriegen*. Darmstadt.
Kirkwood, G. 1993: Review of Kurke 1991, *CPh*, 88: 84–90.
Kissas, K. 2008. *Archaische Architektur der Athener Akropolis. Dachziegel – Metopen – Geisa – Akroterbasen*. Wiesbaden.
(ed.). 2013. *Ancient Corinthia: From Prehistoric Times to the End of Antiquity*. Athens.
Kleine, J. 1973. *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der attischen Kunst von Peisistratos bis Themistokles*. Tübingen.
Kloft, H. 1970. *Liberalitas principis. Herkunft und Bedeutung. Studien zur Prinzipatsideologie*. Cologne and Vienna.
Knippschild, S. 2002. "*Drum bietet zum Bunde die Hände". Rechtssymbolische Akte in zwischenstaatlichen Beziehungen im orientalischen und griechisch-römischen Altertum*. Stuttgart.
Knoepfler, D. 2001. *Décrets érétriens de proxénie et de citoyenneté*. Lausanne.
Koerner, R. 1993. *Inschriftliche Gesetzestexte der frühen Griechischen Polis. Aus dem Nachlaß von R. Koerner* (ed. Kl. Hallof). Cologne.
Kõiv, M. 2013. "Pheidon of Argos," in R. S. Bagnall et al. (eds.), *The Encyclopedia of Ancient History*: 5242–3.
Kolb, F. 1977. "Die Bau-, Religions- und Kulturpolitik der Peisistratiden," *JDAI*, 92: 99–138.
1984. *Die Stadt im Altertum*. Munich.
Kopanias, K. 2006. "Kimon, Mikon und die Datierung des Athener Theseion," in Kreutz and Schweizer (eds.), 155–63.
Korres, M. 1997. "Die Athena-Tempel auf der Akropolis," in Hoepfner (ed.), 218–43.
Kotsidu, H. 1991. *Die musischen Agone der Panathenäen in archaischer und klassischer Zeit. Eine historisch-archäologische Untersuchung*. Munich.
Kralli, I. 1999-2000. "Athens and her Leading Citizens in the Early Hellenistic Period (338–261 B. C.). The Evidence of the Decrees Awarding the Highest Honours," *Archaiognosia* 10: 133–61.
Kraus, W. (ed.). 1985. *Aristophanes' Politische Komödien*. Vienna.
Kremmydas, C. 2012. *Commentary on Demosthenes Against Leptines*. Oxford.

Krentz, P. 1982. *The Thirty at Athens*. Ithaca.
Kreutz, N. 2007. *Zeus und die griechischen Poleis. Topographische und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen von archaischer bis in hellenistische Zeit*. Rahden.
and B. Schweizer (eds.). 2006. *TEKMERIA. Archäologische Zeugnisse in ihrer kulturhistorischen und politischen Dimension. Beiträge für Werner Gauer*. Münster.
Krumeich, R. 1997. *Bildnisse griechischer Herrscher und Staatsmänner im 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr*. Munich.
and C. Witschel. 2009. "Hellenistische Statuen in ihrem räumlichen Kontext: Das Beispiel der Akropolis und der Agora von Athen," in Matthaei and Zimmermann (eds.), 173–226.
Künzi, A. 1923. *Epidosis. Sammlung freiwilliger Beiträge zu Zeiten der Not in Athen*. Bern.
Kurke, L. 1991. *The Traffic in Praise. Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy*. Ithaca and London.
1992. "The Politics of *habrosynê* in Archaic Greece," *ClAnt*, 11: 91–120.
1999. *Coins, Bodies, Games, and Gold. The Politics of Meaning in Archaic Greece*. Princeton.
Kyle, D. G. 1984. "Solon and Athletics," *AncW*, 9: 91–105.
1987. *Athletics in Ancient Athens*. Leiden.
Kyrieleis, H. 1981. *Führer durch das Heraion von Samos*. Athens.
Laburthe-Tolra, P. and J.-P. Warnier. 1993. *Ethnologie. Anthropologie*. Paris.
Lambert, S. D. 1986. "Herodotus, the Cylonian Conspiracy and the Prytanies *tôn Naukrarôn*," *Historia*, 35: 105–12.
1993. *The Phratries of Attica*. Ann Arbor.
(ed.). 2011. *Sociable Man. Essays on Ancient Greek Social Behaviour in Honour of Nick Fisher*. Swansea.
2011a. "What Was the Point of Inscribed Honorific Decrees in Classical Athens?" in Lambert (ed.), 193–214.
2011b. "Some Political Shifts in Lykourgan Athens," in Azoulay and Ismard (eds.), 175–90.
2012a. *Inscribed Athenian Laws and Decrees 352/1–322/1 BC. Epigraphical Essays*. Leiden.
2012b. "Inscribing the Past in Fourth-Century Athens," in Marincola, Llewellyn-Jones, and Maciver (eds.), 253–75.
(ed.). *AOI = Attic Inscriptions Online*, www.atticinscriptions.com
2015. "The Inscribed Version of the Decree Honouring Lykourgos of Boutadai (IG II2 457 and 3207)," in *AOI*: paper no. 6.
(forthcoming). "Another Look at the Sacrificial Calendar of the Marathonian Tetrapolis," in Blok, van den Eijnde, and Strootman (eds.).
Lamoine, L., C. Berrendonner, and M. Cébeillac-Gervasoni (eds.). 2010. *La praxis municipale dans l'Occident romain*. Clermont-Ferrand.
Larson, J. 2001. *Greek Nymphs. Myth, Cult, Lore*. Oxford.
Lattimore, S. 1988. "The Nature of Early Greek Victor Statues," in S. J. Bandy (ed.), *Coroebus Triumphs. The Alliance of Sport and the Arts*. San Diego: 245–56.

Lauffer, S. 1974. "Die Liturgien in der Krisenperiode Athens. Das Problem von Finanzsystem und Demokratie," in E. Ch. Welskopf (ed.), *Hellenische Poleis. Krise – Wandlung – Wirkung*. Berlin: vol. 1, 147–59.
Laum, B. 1914. *Stiftungen in der griechischen und römischen Antike*. Berlin.
Lavelle, B. M. 2005. *Fame, Money, and Power. The Rise of Peisistratos and "Democratic" Tyranny at Athens*. Ann Arbor.
Lawton, C. L. 1995. *Attic Documented Reliefs. Art and Politics in Ancient Athens*. Oxford.
Lederman, R. 2001. "The Anthropology of the Big Man," in Smelser and Baltes (eds.), 1162–5.
Lehmann, G. A. 1996. "Alkibiades »Der Ältere«," in Cancik and Schneider (eds.), *Der Neue Pauly*, vol. 1: col. 500.
Lehmann, L. and S. Kansteiner 2007a. "Kresilas," in Kansteiner et al. (eds.), 57–61.
2007b. "Phidias," in Kansteiner et al. (eds.), 28–52.
Leppin, H. 1995. "Zur Entwicklung der Verwaltung öffentlicher Gelder im Athen des 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.," in Eder (ed.), 557–71.
Lesher, J. H. 1992. *Xenophanes of Colophon. Fragments. A Text and Translation with Commentary*. Toronto.
Levinas, E. 1969. *Totality and Infinity. An Essay on Exteriority*. Pittsburgh.
Lévy, E. 1976. *Athènes devant la défaite de 404. Histoire d'une crise idéologique*. Athens and Paris.
Lewis, D. M., J. Boardman, J. K. Davies, and M. Ostwald (eds.). 1992². *The Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. 5. Cambridge.
and R. S. Stroud. 1979. "Athens Honors King Euagoras of Salamis," *Hesperia*, 48: 180–93.
Lewis, N. 1960. "*Leitourgia* and Related Terms," *GRBS*, 3: 175–84.
Ley-Hutton, C. and K. Brodersen (eds.). 1993–1997. *Isokrates. Sämtliche Werke*. Stuttgart.
Liddel, P. 2003. "The Places of Publication of Athenian State Decrees from the 5th Century BC to the 3rd Century AD," *ZPE*, 143: 79–93.
2007. *Civic Obligation and Individual Liberty in Ancient Athens*. Oxford.
and P. Low. 2013. *Inscriptions and Their Uses in Greek and Latin Literature*. Oxford.
Liebersohn, H. 2011. *The Return of the Gift. European History of a Global Idea*. Cambridge.
Lind, H. 1990. *Der Gerber Kleon in den »Rittern« des Aristophanes. Studien zur Demagogenkomödie*. Frankfurt am Main.
Lindstrom, L. 2010. "Big Man," in Barnard and Spencer (eds.), 80–1.
Lippold, G. 1923. "Siegerstatuen," *Paulys Realencyclopädie*, 2 A 2: cols. 2265–73.
1932. "Mikon," *Paulys Realencyclopädie*, 15.2: cols. 1557–61.
Lolos, Y. 2011. *Land of Sikyon. Archaeology and History of a Greek City-State (= Hesperia Suppl. 39)*. Princeton.
Lomas, K. and T. Cornell (eds.). 2003. *Bread and Circuses. Euergetism and Municipal Patronage in Roman Italy*. New York.
Loraux, N. 1981. *L'invention d'Athènes. Histoire de l'oraison funèbre dans la «cité classique»*. Paris.

Łoś, A. and K. Nawotka (eds.). 2005. *Elite in Greek and Roman Antiquity*. Wroclaw.
Low, P. (ed.). 2008. *The Athenian Empire*. Edinburgh.
Luraghi, N. 1994. *Tirannidi arcaiche in Sicilia e Magna Grecia: da Panezio di Leontini alla caduta dei Dinomenidi*. Florence.
2010. "The Demos as Narrator: Public Honours and the Construction of Future and Past," in Foxhall, Gehrke, and Luraghi (eds.), 247–63.
2013. "One-Man Government. The Greeks and Monarchy," in Beck (ed.), 131–45.
Ma, J. 2002[2]. *Antiochos III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor*. Oxford.
2013. *Statues and Cities. Honorific Portraits and Civic Identity in the Hellenistic World*. Oxford.
Maass, M. 1972. *Die Prohedrie des Dionysostheaters in Athen*. Munich.
MacDowell, D. M. 1978. *The Law in Classical Athens*. Ithaca.
(ed.). 1990. *Demosthenes. Against Meidias (Oration 21)*. Oxford.
2009. *Demosthenes the Orator*. Oxford.
Mack, W. 2015. *Proxeny and Polis. Institutional Networks in the Ancient Greek World*. Oxford.
Mackie, C. J. (ed.). 2004. *Oral Performance and Its Context*. Leiden.
Maddoli, G., M. Nafissi, and V. Saladino. 1999. *Pausania. Guida della Grecia. Libro VI. L'Elide e Olimpia*.
Maehler, H. (ed.). 1982. *Die Lieder des Bakchylides. Die Siegeslieder*. Leiden.
Maidment, K. J. 1941. *Minor Attic Orators*, vol. 1. London.
Maier, F. G. 1959–1961. *Griechische Mauerbauinschriften*. Heidelberg.
Malitz, J. 2008. "Der Preis des Krieges. Thukydides und die Finanzen Athens," in Burrer and Müller (eds.), 28–45.
Malkin, I. 1996. "Temenos," in *OCD*: 1481.
Mann, C. 2001. *Athlet und Polis im archaischen und frühklassischen Griechenland*. Göttingen.
2007. *Die Demagogen und das Volk. Zur politischen Kommunikation im Athen des 5. Jahrhunderts v. Chr*. Berlin.
and P. Scholz. 2012. *"Demokratie" im Hellenismus. Von der Herrschaft des Volkes zur Herrschaft der Honoratioren?* Berlin.
Manni Piraino, M. T. 1968. "Testi e monumenti," *PP*, 15: 419–57.
Marconi, C. (ed.). 2004. *Greek Vases: Images, Contexts and Controversies*. Leiden and Boston.
Marcovich, M. 1978. "Xenophanes on Drinking-Parties and Olympic Games," *ICS*, 3: 1–26.
Marek, C. 1984. *Die Proxenie*. Frankfurt am Main.
Marg, W. (ed.). 1970. *Hesiod: Sämtliche Gedichte. Theogonie, Erga, Frauenkataloge*. Zurich and Stuttgart.
Marín Valdés, F. A. 2008. *Plutarco y el arte de la Atenas hegemónica*. Oviedo.
Marincola, J., L. Llewellyn-Jones, and C. Maciver (eds.) 2012. *Greek Notions of the Past in the Archaic and Classical Eras. History without Historians*. Edinburgh.
Marr, J. L. (ed.). 1998. *Plutarch. Life of Themistocles. Introduction, Text, Translation and Commentary*. Warminster.

Marrou, H.-I. 1948. *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'Antiquité*. Paris.
1956. *A History of Education in Antiquity*. London.
Martzavou, P. and N. Papazarkadas (eds.). 2013. *Epigraphical Approaches to the Post-Classical Polis. Fourth Century BC to Second Century AD*. Oxford.
Masson, O. 1983². *Les inscriptions chypriotes syllabiques*. Paris.
Matthaei, A. and M. Zimmermann (eds.). 2009. *Stadtbilder im Hellenismus*. Berlin.
Matthaiou, A. P. 2011. *Ta en têi stêlêi gegrammena. Six Greek Historical Inscriptions of the Fifth Century B.C.* Athens.
Mattingly, H. B. 1961. "Athens and Euboea," *JHS*, 81: 124–32.
1968. "Athenian Finance in the Peloponnesian War," *BCH*, 92: 450–85.
1990. "Some Fifth-Century Attic Epigraphic Hands," *ZPE*, 83: 110–22.
Mauss, M. 1950. *Essai sur le don*. Paris.
Mazon, P. (ed.). 1914. *Hésiode. Les travaux et les jours*. Paris.
1928 (ed.). *Hésiode. Théogonie, Les travaux et les jours, Le bouclier*. Paris.
McGlew, J. 2012. "Fighting Tyranny in Fifth-Century Athens: Democratic Citizenship and the Oath of Demophantus," *BICS*, 55: 91–9.
McGregor, M. F. 1965. "The Genius of Alkibiades," *Phoenix*, 19: 27–50.
McLean, B. H. 2002. *An Introduction to Greek Epigraphy of the Hellenistic and Roman Periods from Alexander the Great Down to the Reign of Constantine (323 B.C.–A.D. 337)*. Ann Arbor.
Meadows, A. 2006. "The Ptolemaic Annexation of Lycia. SEG 27.929," in Dörtlük et al. (eds.), vol. 2: 459–70.
Meier, C. 1986. "Wie die Athener ihr Gemeinwesen finanzierten. Die Anfänge der Steuerpolitik in der griechischen Antike," in U. Schultz (ed.), *Mit dem Zehnten fing es an. Eine Kulturgeschichte der Steuer*. Munich: 25–37.
1993. *Athen. Ein Neubeginn der Weltgeschichte*. Berlin.
Meier, L. 2013. *Die Finanzierung öffentlicher Bauten in der hellenistischen Polis*. Berlin.
Meier, M. H. E. 1843. *De proxenia sive de publico Graecorum hospitio*. Halle.
Meiggs, R. and D. Lewis (eds.). 1988². *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century B.C.* Oxford.
Mellink, M. 1992. "The Native Kingdoms of Anatolia," in Boardman et al. (eds.), 619–65.
Meritt, B. D. 1936. "The American Excavations in the American Agora: Tenth Report," *Hesperia*, 5: 355–430.
1963. "Greek Inscriptions," *Hesperia*, 32: 1–56.
and J. S. Traill. 1974. *The Athenian Agora. XV. Inscriptions. The Athenian Councillors*. Princeton.
Mette, H. J. 1977. *Urkunden dramatischer Aufführungen in Griechenland*. Berlin and New York.
Metzler, D. 1971. *Porträt und Gesellschaft. Über die Entstehung des griechischen Porträts in der Klassik*. Münster.
Meyer, E. A. 2013. "Inscriptions as Honors and the Athenian Epigraphic Habit," *Historia*, 62: 453–505.

Migeotte, L. 1983. "Souscriptions athéniennes de la période classique," *Historia*, 32: 129–48.
1984. *L'Emprunt public dans les cités grecques: recueil des documents et analyse critique*. Quebec and Paris.
1985. "Réparation de monuments publics à Messène au temps d'Auguste," *BCH*, 109: 597–607.
1992. *Les souscriptions publiques dans les cités grecques*. Geneva and Quebec.
1998a. "Cinq souscriptions féminines à Cos à la période hellénistique," *REA*, 100: 565–78.
1998b. "Souscriptions publiques et privées à Cos," *CEA*, 34: 103–8.
Mikalson, J. D. 1998. *Religion in Hellenistic Athens*. Berkeley.
Millar, F. 1978. Review of Veyne 1976, *The Times Literary Supplement*, March 24: 356.
Miller, S. 1978. *The Prytaneion. Its Function and Architectural Form*. Berkeley.
2004. *Ancient Greek Athletics*. New Haven and London.
2012³. *Arete. Greek Sports from Ancient Sources*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and Oxford.
Millett, P. 1984. "Hesiod and his World," *PCPhS*, 210: 84–115.
1989. "Patronage and Its Avoidance in Classical Athens," in Wallace-Hadrill (ed.), 15–47.
1991. *Lending and Borrowing in Ancient Athens*. Cambridge.
1998. "The Rhetoric of Reciprocity in Classical Athens," in Gill, Postlethwaite, and Seaford (eds.), 227–53.
and S. Todd (eds.). 1990. *Nomos. Essays in Athenian Law, Politics and Society*. Cambridge.
Millis, B. W. and S. D. Olson. 2012. Inscriptional Records for the Dramatic Festivals in Athens: IG II² 2318–2325 and Related Texts. Leiden and Boston.
Missiou, A. 1992. *The Subversive Oratory of Andokides. Politics, Ideology and Decision-Making in Democratic Athens*. Cambridge.
1998. "Reciprocal Generosity in the Foreign Affairs of Fifth-Century Athens and Sparta," in Gill, Postlethwaite, and Seaford (eds.), 181–97.
Mitchell, B. M. 1975. "Herodotus and Samos," *JHS*, 95: 75–91.
Mitchell, L. G. 1997. *Greeks Bearing Gifts. The Public Use of Private Relationships in the Greek World, 435–323 BC*. Cambridge.
2013. *The Heroic Rulers of Archaic and Classical Greece*. London and New York.
and P. J. Rhodes (eds.). 1997. *The Development of the Polis in Archaic Greece*. London.
Monceaux, P. 1886. *Les proxénies grecques*. Paris.
Mordtmann, J. H. 1880. "Epigraphische Mitteilungen II. Archaische Inschrift aus Kyzikos," *Hermes*, 15: 92–8.
Moreno, A. 2007. *Feeding the Democracy. The Athenian Grain Supply in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries BC*. Oxford.
Moreno, P. 1987. *Vita e arte di Lisippo*. Milan.
Moretti, L. 1953. *Iscrizioni agonistiche greche*. Rome.
1957. *Olympionikai. I vincitori negli antichi agoni olimpici*. Rome.
1967–1975. *Iscrizioni storiche ellenistiche*. Florence.

1970. "Supplemento al catalogo degli Olympionikai," *Klio*, 52: 295–303.
Morgan, C. 1990. *Athletes and Oracles. The Transformation of Olympia and Delphi in the Eighth Century BC*. Cambridge.
Morgan, K. A. (ed.). 2003. *Popular Tyranny. Sovereignty and Its Discontents in Classical Athens*. Austin.
2015. *Pindar and the Construction of Syracusan Monarchy in the Fifth Century*. Oxford.
Morris, I. 1998. "Archaeology and Archaic Greek History," in Fisher and van Wees (eds.), 1–91.
2000. *Archaeology as Cultural History*. Malden, MA and Oxford.
2005. "The Athenian Empire (478–404 BCE)," *Princeton/Stanford Working Papers in Classics* 120508.
2007. "Early Iron Age Greece," in Scheidel, Morris, and Saller (eds.), 211–41.
2009. "The Eighth-Century Revolution," in Raaflaub and van Wees (eds.), 64–80.
Morrison, A. D. 2012. "Performance, Re-Perfomance and Pindar's Audiences," in Agócs, Carey, and Rawles (eds.), 111–33.
Morrissey, C. S. (ed.). 2012. *Hesiod. Theogony, Works and Days*. Vancouver.
Morrissey, E. J. 1978. "Victors in the Prytaneion Decree (*IG* I² 77)," *GRBS*, 19: 121–5.
Mossé, C. 1962. *La fin de la démocratie athénienne. Aspects sociaux et politiques du déclin de la cité grecque au IVe siècle avant J.-C*. Paris.
1969. *La tyrannie dans la Grèce antique*. Paris.
1995. "La classe politique à Athènes au IVème siècle," in Eder (ed.), 67–77.
Most, G. W. (ed.). 2006. *Hesiod. Theogony, Works and Days, Testimonia*. Cambridge, MA.
Munn, M. 2000. *The School of History. Athens in the Age of Socrates*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London.
2006. *The Mother of the Gods, Athens, and the Tyranny of Asia. A Study of Sovereignty in Ancient Religion*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London.
Murray, O. 1990. "The Solonian Law of Hubris," in Cartledge, Millett, and Todd (eds.), 139–45.
1993². *Early Greece*. Cambridge, MA.
Neil, R. A. (ed.). 1909. *The Knights of Aristophanes*. Cambridge.
Neils, J. 2007. "Replicating Tradition: The First Celebrations of the Greater Panathenaia," in Palagia and Choremi-Spetsieri (eds.), 41–51.
Nelson, S. and R. Caldwell (eds.). 2009. *Hesiod. Theogony & Works and Days. Introduction, Translation and Commentary*. Newburyport, MA.
Nenci, G. (ed.). 1994. *Erodoto. Le Storie. Volume V. La rivolta della Ionia*. Verona.
Neudecker, R. 2001. "Statue," in Cancik and Schneider (eds.), *Der Neue Pauly*, vol. 11: cols. 931–4.
Neumann-Hartmann, A. 2009. *Epinikien und ihr Aufführungsrahmen*. Hildesheim.
Nicholson, N. J. 2005. *Aristocracy and Athletics in Archaic and Classical Greece*. Cambridge.

Nicolai, W. 1964. *Hesiods Erga. Beobachtungen zum Aufbau*. Heidelberg.
Nilsson, M. P. 1967. Geschichte der griechischen Religion[3]. Vol. I. Munich.
Nippel, W. 1982. "Die Heimkehr der Argonauten aus der Südsee. Ökonomische Anthropologie und die Theorie der griechischen Gesellschaft in klassischer Zeit," *Chiron*, 12: 1–39.
Noussia-Fantuzzi, M. 2010. *Solon the Athenian. The Poetic Fragments*. Leiden and Boston.
Ober, J. 1989. *Mass and Elite in Democratic Athens. Rhetoric, Ideology, and the Power of the People*. Princeton.
1998. *Political Dissent in Democratic Athens. Intellectual Critics of Popular Rule*. Princeton.
2008. *Democracy and Knowledge. Innovation and Learning in Classical Athens*. Princeton.
Oehler, J. 1912. "Gymnasiarchos," *Paulys Realencyclopädie*, 7.2: cols. 1969–2004.
1925. "Leiturgie," *Paulys Realencyclopädie*, 12.2: cols. 1871–9.
Oliva, P. 1979. "Zur Problematik der frühen griechischen Tyrannis," in Kinzl (ed.), 226–36.
2000. "Die frühgriechische Tyrannis," *Eirene*, 36: 27–35.
Osborne, M. J. 1981. "Entertainment in the Prytaneion at Athens," *ZPE*, 41: 153–70.
1981–1983. *Naturalization in Athens*, vols. 1–4. Brussels.
Osborne, R. 1985. *Demos. The Discovery of Classical Attika*. Cambridge.
2004. *Greek History*. London and New York.
(ed.). 2007. *Debating the Athenian Cultural Revolution. Art, Literature, Philosophy, and Politics 430–380BC*. Cambridge.
2009[2]. *Greece in the Making, 1200–479 BC*. London and New York.
2010. *Athens and Athenian Democracy*. Cambridge.
Ostwald, M. 1951. "The Prytaneion Decree Re-examined," *AJPh*, 72: 24–46.
1986. *From Popular Sovereignty to the Sovereignty of Law. Law, Society, and Politics in Fifth-Century Athens*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London.
1995. "Public Expense: Whose Obligation? Athens 600–454 B.C.E.," *PAPhS*, 139: 368–79.
O'Sullivan, L. 2009. *The Regime of Demetrius of Phalerum in Athens, 317–307 BCE. A Philosopher in Politics*. Leiden and Boston.
O'Sullivan, P. 2003. "Victory Statue, Victory Song. Pindar's Agonistic Poetics and Its Legacy," in Phillips and Pritchard (eds.), 75–100.
Palagia, O. and A. Choremi-Spetsieri (eds.). 2007. *The Panathenaic Games*. Oxford.
and D. M. Lewis. 1989. "The Ephebes of Erechtheis, 333/2 BC and Their Dedication," *ABSA*, 84: 333–44.
and J. J. Pollitt (eds.). 1996. *Personal Styles in Greek Sculpture*. Cambridge.
Paleothodoros, D. 2012. "Dionysos in Late Archaic Athens," *Electra*, 2: 51–67.
Paley, F. A. (ed.). 1861. *The Epics of Hesiod. With an English Commentary*. London.
Papadopoulos, J. K. and E. L. Smithson. 2002. "The Cultural Biography of a Cycladic Geometric Amphora: Islanders in Athens and the Prehistory of Metics," *Hesperia*, 71: 149–99.

Papakonstantinou, Z. 2013. "Cimon the Elder, Peisistratus and the Tethrippon Olympic Victory of 532 BCE," *JAH*, 1: 99–118.
Papazarkadas, N. 2011. *Sacred and Public Land in Ancient Athens*. Oxford.
(ed.). 2014. *The Epigraphy and History of Boeotia. New Finds, New Prospects*. Leiden.
Papenfuss, D. and V. M. Strocka (eds.). 2001. *Gab es das griechische Wunder? Griechenland zwischen dem Ende des 6. und der Mitte des 5. Jahrhunderts v. Chr*. Mainz.
Parker, R. 1996. *Athenian Religion. A History*. Oxford.
and D. Obbink. 2001. "Aus der Arbeit der «Inscriptiones Graecae» VIII. Three Further Inscriptions Concerning Coan Cults," *Chiron*, 31: 253–71.
Parker, V. 2007. "Tyrants and Lawgivers," in Shapiro (ed.), 13–39.
Paschidis, P. 2008. *Between City and King. Prosopographical Studies on the Intermediaries between the Cities of the Greek Mainland and the Aegean and the Royal Courts in the Hellenistic Period (322–190 BC)*. Athens.
Pascual, J., B. Antela-Bernárdez, and D. Gómez Castro (eds.) [forthcoming]. *El mundo griego en el siglo IV a. C. Pervivencias, cambios y transformaciones*. Madrid.
Paton, W. R. and E. L. Hicks. 1891. *The Inscriptions of Cos*. Oxford.
Pedley, J. G. 2012[5]. *Greek Art and Archaeology*. Upper Saddle River, NJ.
Peek, W. 1942. "Attische Inschriften," *MDAI(A)* 67: 1–217.
Peigney, J. (ed.). 2011. *Amis et ennemis en Grèce ancienne*. Bordeaux.
Pekáry, T. 1979[2]. *Die Wirtschaft der griechisch-römischen Antike*. Wiesbaden.
Petrovik, A. 2007. *Kommentar zu den simonideischen Versinschriften*. Leiden.
2013. "Inscribed Epigrams in Orators and Epigrammatic Collections," in Liddel and Low (eds.), 197–213.
Pettegrew, D. K. 2011. "The Diolkos of Corinth," *AJA*, 115: 549–74.
Pfeijffer, I. J. 1999. *Three Aeginetan Odes of Pindar. A Commentary on Nemean V, Nemean III & Pythian VIII*. Leiden and Boston.
Phillips, D. and D. Pritchard (eds.). 2003. *Sport and Festival in the Ancient Greek World*. Swansea.
Piekarski, D. 2004. *Anonyme griechische Porträts des 4. Jhs. v. Chr. Chronologie und Typologie*. Rahden.
Pietri, L. 2002. "Évergétisme chrétien et fondations privées dans l'Italie de l'Antiquité tardive," in J.-M. Carrié and R. Lizzi Testa (eds.), *Humana Sapit*. Turnhout: 253–64.
Piñol Villanueva, A. 2013. "Acceso de extranjeros a bienes inmuebles: primeros testimonios (siglos VIII–V a.C.)," in Santiago Álvarez and Oller Guzmán (eds.), 113–45.
Plácido, D. and C. Fornis. 2011. "Evergetismo y relaciones clientelares en la sociedad ateniense del siglo IV a.C.," *DHA*, 37: 19–47.
Pleket, H. W. 1964. *Epigraphica I: Texts on the Economic History of the Greek World*. Leiden.
1974. "Zur Soziologie des antiken Sports," *MNIR*, 36: 57–87.
Podlecki, A. J. 1975. *The Life of Themistocles. A Critical Survey of the Literary and Archaeological Evidence*. Montreal and London.

1998. *Perikles and his Circle*. London and New York.
Postlethwaite, N. 1998. "Akhilleus and Agamemnon: Generalized Reciprocity," in Gill, Postlethwaite, and Seaford (eds.), 93–104.
Potts, S. 2011. "Co-operation, Competition and Clients: The Social Dynamics of the Athenian Navy," in Lambert (ed.), 45–66.
Pouilloux, J. 1954. *La forteresse de Rhamnonte*. Paris.
Powell, J. E. 1938. *A Lexicon to Herodotus*. Cambridge.
Pownall, F. 2013. "Public Administration," in Beck (ed.), 287–301.
Pritchard, D. M. 2003. "Athletics, Education and Participation in Classical Athens," in Phillips and Pritchard (eds.), 293–349.
(ed.). 2010. *War, Democracy and Culture in Classical Athens*. Cambridge.
2010. "The Symbiosis between Democracy and War. The Case of Ancient Athens," in Pritchard (ed.), 1–62.
2012. "Public Honours for Panhellenic Sporting Victors in Democratic Athens," *Nikephoros*, 25: 209–20.
Pritchett, W. K. 1974. *The Greek State at War. Part I*. Berkeley.
1991. *The Greek State at War. Part V*. Berkeley.
Procopé, J. F. 1989. "Democritus on Politics and the Care of the Soul," *CQ*, NS 39: 307–31.
1990. "Democritus on Politics and the Care of the Soul: Appendix," *CQ*, NS 40: 21–45.
Pugliese Carratelli, G. et al. 1978. *Origini e sviluppo della città. L'arcaismo (Storia e Civiltà dei Greci*. vol. 1, 2). Milan.
Quass, F. 1993. *Die Honoratiorenschicht in den Städten des griechischen Ostens. Untersuchungen zur politischen und sozialen Entwicklung in hellenistischer und römischer Zeit*. Stuttgart.
Raaflaub, K. 1998a. "A Historian's Headache: How to Read 'Homeric Society'?" in Fisher and van Wees (eds.), 169–93.
1998b. "The Transformation of Athens in the Fifth Century," in Boedecker and Raaflaub (eds.), 15–41.
2003. "Stick and Glue: The Function of Tyranny in Fifth-Century Athenian Democracy," in Morgan (ed.), 59–93.
and H. van Wees (eds.). 2009. *A Companion to Archaic Greece*. Malden, MA and Oxford.
Raubitschek, A. E. 1939. "Leagros," *Hesperia*, 9: 155–64.
1940. "Two Monuments Erected after the Victory of Marathon," *AJA*, 44: 53–9.
1943. "The Athenian Property on Euboia," *Hesperia*, 12: 28–33.
1949. *Dedications from the Athenian Acropolis*. Cambridge, MA.
1973–1974. "Zur Periklesstatue des Kresilas," *ArchClass*, 25–6: 620–1.
Rausa, F. 1994. *L'immagine del vincitore. L'atleta nella statuaria greca dall'età arcaica all'ellenismo*. Rome.
Raviola, F. 2005. "Erodoto e la *xenia* fra Sibari e Mileto," *Anemos*, 3: 101–23.
Rawles, R. 2012. "Early Epinician. Ibycus and Simonides," in Agócs, Carey, and Rawles (eds.), 3–27.
Reinmuth, O. W. 1971. *The Ephebic Inscriptions of the Fourth Century B.C*. Leiden.

Reisch, E. 1890. *Griechische Weihgeschenke*. Vienna.
1899. "Chorêgia," *Paulys Realencyclopädie*, 3.2: cols. 2409–22.
Rhodes, P. J. 1981. *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia*. Oxford.
1984. "Xenia and Deipnon in the Prytaneum," *ZPE*, 57: 193–9.
1985a[2]. *The Athenian Boule*. Oxford.
1985b. *What Alcibiades Did or What Happened to Him*. Durham.
1986. "Political Activity in Classical Athens," *JHS*, 106: 132–44.
(ed.). 1988. *Thucydides. History II*. Warminster.
2000. "Naukraria, naukraros," in Cancik and Schneider (eds.), *Der Neue Pauly*, vol. 8: cols. 745–6.
2011. *Alcibiades. Athenian Playboy, General and Traitor*. Barnsley.
2013. "The Organization of the Athenian Public Finance," *G&R*, 60: 203–31.
and D. M. Lewis. 1997. *The Decrees of the Greek States*. Oxford.
and R. Osborne. 2003. *Greek Historical Inscriptions: 404–323 BC*. Oxford.
Richter, G. M. A. 1955. *Greek Portraits: A Study of their Development*. Brussels.
1960[2]. *Kouroi. Archaic Greek Youths. A Study of the Development of the Kouros Type in Greek Sculpture*. London.
1965. *The Portraits of the Greeks*, vols. 1–3. London.
Ridgway, B. S. 1970. *The Severe Style in Greek Sculpture*. Princeton.
1977. *The Archaic Style in Greek Sculpture*. Princeton.
1990. *Hellenistic Sculpture I. The Styles of ca. 331–200 B.C.* Madison.
Rihll, T. E. 1987. "The Attic naukrariai," *LCM*, 12: 10.
Rivolta, C. M. 2014: "Il decreto del pritaneo e la concessione della *sitesis* nel V secolo," *Erga–Logoi*, 2: 79–91.
Robbins, E. 1997. "Epinikion," in Cancik and Schneider (eds.), *Der Neue Pauly*, vol. 3: cols. 1147–8.
Robert, J. and L. Robert. 1983. *Fouilles d'Amyzon en Carie. Exploration, histoire, monnaies et inscriptions*. Paris.
Robert, L. 1929. "Études d'épigraphie grecque," *RPh*, n. s. 3: 122–58.
1950. *Hellenica. Recueil d'épigraphie, de numismatique et d'antiquités grecques*, vol. 9. Paris.
1969. *Opera minora selecta. Épigraphie et antiquités grecques*, vol. 2, Amsterdam.
Robertson, N. 1999. "The Stoa of the Herms," *ZPE*, 127: 167–72.
Robinson, E. W. 2011. *Democracy beyond Athens. Popular Government in the Greek Classical Age*. Cambridge.
Robu, A. 2014. "Between Macedon, Achaea and Boeotia: The Epigraphy of Hellenistic Megara Revisited," in Papazarkadas (ed.), 95–118.
Roisman, J. 2007. "Rhetoric, Manliness and Contest," in Worthington (ed.), 393–410.
Rose, P. W. 2009. "Class," in Raaflaub and van Wees (eds.), 468–82.
2012. *Class in Archaic Greece*. Cambridge.
Rosen, R. and I. Sluiter (eds.). 2010. *Valuing Others in Classical Antiquity*. Leiden.
Rouse, W. H. D. 1902. *Greek Votive Offerings. An Essay in the History of Greek Religion*. Cambridge.
Şahin, M. Ç. 1976. "Five New Inscriptions from Halicarnassus," *ZPE*, 20: 19–23.

Sahlins, M. 1963. "Poor Man, Rich Man, Big Man, Chief: Political Types in Melanesia and Polynesia," *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 5/3: 285–303.
1965. "On the Sociology of Primitive Exchange," in M. Banton (ed.), *The Relevance of Models for Social Anthropology*. London: 139–236 (repr. in Sahlins 1972: 185–275).
1972. *Stone Age Economics*. London.
Saïd, S. and M. Trédé-Boulmer. 1984. "L'éloge de la cité du vainqueur dans les épinicies de Pindare," *Ktéma*, 9: 161–70.
Salmon, J. 1984. *Wealthy Corinth. A History of the City to 338 BC*. Oxford.
1997. "Lopping off the Heads? Tyrants, Politics and the *Polis*," in Mitchell and Rhodes (eds.), 60–73.
Salzman, M. R. and C. Rapp (eds.). 2000. Elites in Late Antiquity (= Arethusa 33). Baltimore.
Samons, L. J. 2000. *Empire of the Owl. Athenian Imperial Finance*. Stuttgart.
(ed.). 2007. *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Pericles*. Cambridge.
Sancisi-Weerdenburg, H. (ed.). 2000. *Peisistratos and the Tyranny. A Reappraisal of the Evidence*. Amsterdam.
Santi, F. 2009. Review of Kissas 2008, *ArchClass*, 60: 467–72.
2010. *I frontoni arcaici dell'Acropoli di Atene*. Rome.
Santiago Álvarez, R.-A. and M. Oller Guzmán (eds.). 2013. *Contacto de poblaciones y extranjería en el mundo griego antiguo. Estudio de fuentes (= Faventia. Supplementa 2)*. Bellaterra.
Sartre, M. 1991. *L'Orient romain. Provinces et sociétés provinciales en Méditerranée orientale d'Auguste aux Sévères (31 avant J.-C.–235 après J.-C.)*. Paris.
Satlow, M. L. (ed.). 2013. *The Gift in Antiquity*. Malden, MA and Oxford.
Savalli-Lestrade, I. 1985. "I neocittadini nelle città ellenistiche. Note sulla concessione e l'acquisizione della *politeia*," *Historia*, 34: 387–431.
1993. "Archippe di Kyme, la benefattrice," in N. Loraux (ed.), *Grecia al femminile*. Rome and Bari: 229–73.
2003. "Remarques sur les élites dans les poleis hellénistiques," in Cébeillac-Gervasoni and Lamoine (eds.), 51–64.
Schefold, K. 1997^{2}. *Die Bildnisse der antiken Dichter, Redner und Denker*. Basel.
Scheid-Tissinier, E. 1994. *Les usages du don chez Homère. Vocabulaire et pratiques*. Nancy.
Scheidel, W., I. Morris, and R. Saller (eds.). 2007. *The Cambridge Economic History of the Greco-Roman World*. Cambridge.
Schmitt Pantel, P. 1980. "Les repas au Prytanée et à la Tholos dans l'Athènes classique. *Sitesis, trophè, misthos*: Réflexions sur le mode de nourriture démocratique," *AION (archeol.)*, 2: 55–68.
1992. *La cité au banquet: histoire des repas publics dans les cités grecques*. Rome.
Schlegel, C. and H. Weinfield (eds.). 2006. *Hesiod. Theogony and Works and Days*. Translated and with Introduction. Ann Arbor.
Schmitz, W. 1995. "Reiche und Gleiche: Timokratische Gliederung und demokratische Gleichheit der athenischen Bürger im 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr.," in Eder (ed.), 573–97.

Schoch, K. 2009. *Die doppelte Aphrodite – alt und neu bei griechischen Kultbildern*. Göttingen.
Scholl, A. 2006. "*Anathêmata tôn archaiôn*. Die Akropolisvotive aus dem 8. bis frühen 6. Jahrhundert v. Chr. und die Staatswerdung Athens," *JDAI*, 121: 1–173.
Schöll, R. 1872. "Die Speisung im Prytaneion zu Athen," *Hermes*, 6, 14–54.
Schrift, A. D. 1997. *The Logic of the Gift. Towards an Ethic of Generosity*. New York.
Schubart, W. 1937. "Das hellenistische Königsideal nach Inschriften und Papyri," *APF*, 12, 1–26.
Schubert, C. 2008: "Die Naukrarien: zur Entwicklung der attischen Finanzadministration," *Historia*, 57: 38–64.
Schubert, J. G. 1881. *De proxenia attica*. Leipzig.
Schwandner, E.-L. and K. Rheidt (eds.). 2004. *Macht der Architektur – Architektur der Macht. Bauforschungskolloquium in Berlin vom 30. Oktober bis 2. November 2002*. Mainz.
Schweitzer, B. 1963. "Studien zur Entstehung des Porträts bei den Griechen," in *Zur Kunst der Antike. Ausgewählte Schriften*. Tübingen: 115–67.
Seaford, R. 1998. "Introduction," in Gill, Postlethwaite, and Seaford, 1–11.
2004. *Money and the Early Greek Mind. Homer, Philosophy, Tragedy*. Cambridge.
2011. "Exchange," in Finkelberg (ed.), 281–4.
Sealey, R. 1976. *A History of the Greek City-States ca. 700–338 B. C*. Berkeley.
1993. *Demosthenes and His Time. A Study in Defeat*. Oxford.
Seaman, K. 2002. "Athletes and Agora-Phobia? Commemorative Athletic Sculpture in Classical Athens," *Nikephoros*, 15: 99–115.
Sears, M. A. 2013. *Athens, Thrace, and the Shaping of Athenian Leadership*. Cambridge.
Segre, M. 1993. *Iscrizioni di Cos*. Rome.
Seibert, J. 1979. *Die politischen Flüchtlinge und Verbannten in der griechischen Geschichte*. Darmstadt.
Sekunda, N. V. 1990. "*IG* ii^2 1250: A Decree Concerning the Lampadephoroi of the Tribe Aiantis," *ZPE*, 83: 149–82.
Settis, S. (ed.). 1996. *I Greci. Storia, Cultura, Arte, Società. 2. Una storia greca I. Formazione*. Turin.
Shapiro, H. A. 1989. *Art and Cult under the Tyrants in Athens*. Mainz.
2004. "Leagros the Satyr," in Marconi (ed.), 1–11.
(ed.). 2007. *The Cambridge Companion to Archaic Greece*. Cambridge.
2012. "Attic Heroes and the Construction of the Athenian Past in the Fifth Century," in Marincola, Llewellyn-Jones, and Maciver (eds.), 160–82.
Shear, J. L. 2007. "Cultural Change, Space, and the Politics of Commemoration in Athens," in R. Osborne (ed.), 91–115.
2011. *Polis and Revolution. Responding to Oligarchy in Classical Athens*. Cambridge.
Shear, T. L. 1935. "The Campaign of 1934," *Hesperia*, 4: 340–70.
1938. "The Campaign of 1937," *Hesperia*, 7: 311–62.

Shear, T. L., Jr. 1978a. *Kallias of Sphettos and the Revolt of Athens in 286 B.C. (= Hesperia Suppl. 17)*. Princeton.
1978b. "Tyrants and Buildings in Archaic Athens. Athens Comes of Age," in W. A. P. Childs (ed.), *Athens Comes of Age. From Solon to Salamis. Papers of a Symposium Sponsored by the Archaeological Institute of America, Princeton Society and the Department of Art and Archaeology, Princeton University*. Princeton: 1–19.
Sherwin–White, S. M. 1978. *Ancient Cos. An Historical Study from the Dorian Settlement to the Imperial Period*. Göttingen.
Shipley, G. 1987. *A History of Samos, 800–188 B.C.* Oxford.
Sinclair, R. K. 1988. *Democracy and Participation in Athens*. Cambridge.
Sinclair, T. A. (ed.). 1932. *Hesiod. Works and Days*. London.
Smelser, N. J. and P. B. Baltes (eds.). 2001. *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*. Amsterdam and New York.
Smith, A. C. 2011. *Polis and Personification in Classical Athenian Art*. Leiden.
Smith, R. R. R. 2007. "Pindar, Athletes, and the Early Greek Statue Habit," in Hornblower and Morgan (eds.), 83–139.
Snodgrass, A. 1980. *Archaic Greece. The Age of Experiment*. Berkeley and Los Angeles.
Sommerstein, A. H. 2014. "The Authenticity of the Demophantus Decree," *CQ*, 64: 49–57.
and J. Bayliss. 2013. *Oath and State in Ancient Greece*. Berlin and Boston.
Sonnabend, H. 1999. "Lindos," in Cancik and Schneider (eds.), *Der Neue Pauly*, vol. 7: cols. 239–40.
Spawforth, A. J. 2012[4]. "Euergetism," in S. Hornblower, A. Spawforth, and E. Eidinow, *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Oxford: 566.
Spitzer, P. 1994. "Hospitalité et invitation au Prytanée," *CCG*, 5: 27–49.
Stadter, P. A. 1989. *A Commentary on Plutarch's Pericles*. Chapel Hill and London.
Stahl, M. 1987. *Aristokraten und Tyrannen im archaischen Athen. Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung, zur Sozialstruktur und zur Entstehung des Staates*. Stuttgart.
and U. Walter. 2009. "Athens," in Raaflaub and van Wees (eds.), 138–61.
Stamatopoulou, M. and M. Yeroulanou (eds.). 2002. *Excavating Classical Culture: Recent Archaeological Discoveries in Greece*. Oxford.
Stansbury-O'Donnell, M. D. 2005. "The Painting Program in the Stoa Poikile," in Barringer and Hurwit (eds.), 73–87.
Starr, C. G. 1977. *The Economic and Social Growth of Early Greece, 800–500 B.C.* New York.
1986. *Individual and Community. The Rise of the Polis, 800–500 B.C.* New York and Oxford.
Stein-Hölkeskamp, E. 1989. *Adelskultur und Polisgesellschaft. Studien zum griechischen Adel in archaischer und klassischer Zeit*. Stuttgart.
1996. "Tirannidi e ricerca dell'eunomia," in Settis (ed.), 653–79.
1999. "Kimon und die athenische Demokratie," *Hermes*, 127: 145–64.
2009. "The Tyrants," in Raaflaub and van Wees (eds.), 100–116.
Steinbock, B. 2013. *Social Memory in Athenian Public Discourse. Uses and Meanings of the Past*. Ann Arbor.

Steiner, D. 1993. "Pindar's 'Oggetti Parlanti,'" *HSCPh*, 95: 159–80.
1994. *The Tyrant's Writ. Myths and Images of Writing in Ancient Greece*. Princeton.
2001. *Images in Mind. Statues in Archaic and Classical Greek Literature and Thought*. Princeton.
Stevens, P. T. (ed.). 1971. *Euripides. Andromache*. Oxford.
Stewart, A. 1990. *Greek Sculpture. An Exploration*. New Haven.
2012. Review of Santi 2010, *AJA*, 116: www.ajaonline.org/online-review-book/1095
Stieber, M. C. 2004. *The Poetics of Appearance in the Attic Korai*. Austin.
Stier, H. E. 1938. "Phayllos, 2," *Paulys Realencyclopädie*, 19.2: cols. 1903–4.
Stinchcombe, A. L. 1986. *Stratification and Organization. Selected Papers*. Cambridge.
Stoop, M. W. and G. Pugliese Carratelli. 1965. "Tabella con iscrizione arcaica," *Atti e Memorie della Società Magna Grecia*, 6: 17–21.
Strasburger, G. 1984. *Lexikon zur frühgriechischen Geschichte auf der Grundlage von Herodots Werk verfasst*. Zurich.
Strathmann, H. 1938. "*Leitourgeô, leitourgia*," in G. Kittel (ed.), *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*. Stuttgart, vol. 4: 221–9.
Strauss, B. S. 1986. *Athens after the Peloponnesian War. Class, Faction, and Policy, 403–386 B.C.* London.
Stroud, R. S. 1971. "Greek Inscriptions: Theozotides and the Athenian Orphans," *Hesperia*, 40: 280–301.
Taeger, F. 1943. *Alkibiades*. Munich.
Tandy, D. W. and W. C. Neale (eds.). 1996. *Hesiod's Works and Days. A Translation and Commentary for the Social Sciences*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London.
Tasinos, V. 2013. "Isthmia," in Kissas (ed.), 13–30.
Taylor, M. C. 2002. "One Hundred Heroes of Phyle?" *Hesperia*, 71: 377–97.
Taylor, M. W. 1991^{2}. *The Tyrant Slayers. The Heroic Image in Fifth Century B.C. Athenian Art and Politics*. New York.
Teegarden, D. 2013. *Death to Tyrants! Ancient Greek Democracy and the Struggle against Tyranny*. Princeton.
Terrell, J. 1997. "Bigman, Big-Man, Big Man," in Barfield (ed.), 35–6.
Thiers, C. 2006. "Égyptiens et grecs au service des cultes indigènes. Un aspect de l'évergétisme en Égypte lagide," in M. Molin (ed.), *Les régulations sociales dans l'Antiquité*. Rennes: 275–301.
Thomsen, R. 1964. *Eisphora; a Study of Direct Taxation in Ancient Athens*. Copenhagen.
Thomson, W. E. 1971. "The Prytaneion Decree," *AJPh*, 92: 226–37.
Thummer, E. 1968. *Pindar. Die isthmischen Gedichte*. Heidelberg.
Tiersch, C. (forthcoming). *Demokratie und Elite. Zur Rolle und Bedeutung der politischen Elite in der athenischen Demokratie (480–322 v. Chr.)*. Habilitationsschrift, Dresden.
Tietz, W. 2003. *Der Golf von Fethiye. Politische, ethnische und kulturelle Strukturen einer Grenzregion vom Beginn der nachweisbaren Besiedlung bis in die römische Kaiserzeit*. Bonn.

Titchener, F. (forthcoming). *Plutarch's Life of Nicias. A Commentary*. Leuven.
Toepffer, J. 1894. "Alkibiades," *Paulys Realencyclopädie*, 1.2: cols. 1516–33.
Tölle-Kastenbein, R. 1976. *Herodot und Samos*. Bochum.
1994. *Das Olympieion in Athen*. Cologne.
Too, Y. L. 2008. *A Commentary on Isocrates'* Antidosis. Oxford.
Tracy, S. V. 1995. *Athenian Democracy in Transition. Attic Letter-Cutters of 340 to 290 B.C.* Berkeley.
2009. *Pericles. A Sourcebook and Reader*. Berkeley.
(forthcoming). *Athenian Lettering of the Fifth Century B.C. The Rise of the Professional Letter Cutter*. Berlin.
Travlos, J. 1971. *Bildlexikon zur Topographie des antiken Athen*. Tübingen.
Treu, M. 1958. "Eine Art von Choregie in peisistratischer Zeit," *Historia*, 7: 385–91.
Tsetskhladze, G. R. (ed.) 2006–2008. *Greek Colonisation. An Account of Greek Colonies and Other Settlements Overseas*, vols. 1–2. Leiden and Boston.
Tully, J. 2006. "Democracy in Action: Office-Holding in Fourth Century Athens. Pytheas of Alopece and the Panathenaic Quadrennium," *Historia*, 55: 504–8.
Ulf, C. 2009. "The World of Homer and Hesiod," in Raaflaub and Van Wees (eds.), 81–99.
Ure, P. N. 1922. *The Origin of Tyranny*. Cambridge.
Van Bremen, R. 1996. *The Limits of Participation: Women and Civic Life in the Greek East in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods*. Amsterdam.
Van Effenterre, H. and F. Ruzé. 1994–1995. *Nomima. Recueil d'inscriptions politiques et juridiques de l'archaïsme grec*. Paris and Rome.
Van Groningen, B. A. 1933. *Aristote. Le second livre de l'Économique*. Leiden.
Van Nijf, O. M. and R. Alston (eds.). 2011. *Political Culture in the Greek City after the Classical Age*. Leuven.
Van Wees, H. 1992. *Status Warriors. War, Violence and Society in Homer and History*. Amsterdam.
1998. "The Law of Gratitude: Reciprocity in Anthropological Theory," in Gill, Postlethwaite, and Seaford (eds.), 13–49.
1999. "The Mafia of Early Greece. Violent Exploitation in the Seventh and Sixth Centuries B.C.," in Hopwood (ed.), 1–51.
(ed.). 2000. *War and Violence in Ancient Greece*. London.
2009. "The Economy," in Raaflaub and van Wees (eds.), 444–67.
2013. *Ships and Silver, Taxes and Tribute. A Fiscal History of Archaic Athens*. London and New York.
Veligianni-Terzi, C. 1997. *Wertbegriffe in den attischen Ehrendekreten der klassischen Zeit*. Stuttgart.
Vélissaropoulos, J. 1980. *Les Nauclères grecs. Recherches sur les institutions maritimes en Grèce et dans l'Orient hellénisé*. Geneva and Paris.
Verdegem, S. 2010. *Plutarch's Life of Alcibiades. Story, Text and Moralism*. Leuven.
Verdenius, W. J. 1985. *A Commentary on Hesiod, Works and Days, vv.* 1–382. Leiden.
Vernant, J.-P. 1982. *The Origins of Greek Thought*. Ithaca.
Veyne, P. 1969. "Panem et circenses: l'évergétisme devant les sciences humaines," *Annales (ESC)*, 24: 785–825.

1971. *Comment on écrit l'histoire*. Paris.
1976a. *Le pain et le cirque: sociologie historique d'un pluralisme politique*. Paris.
1976b. *L'inventaire des différences*. Paris.
1990. *Bread and Circuses. Historical Sociology and Political Pluralism*. London (abridged translation of Veyne 1976).
Virgilio, B. 1975. *Commento storico al quinto libro delle « Storie » die Erodoto*. Pisa.
Vlachos, G. C. 1974. *Les sociétés politiques homériques*. Paris.
Vlassopoulos, K. 2007. Review of Hall 2014 (first edition 2007), *BMCR*, 01. 41.
Von Gaertringen, H. 1907. "Euthymos, 1," *Paulys Realencyclopädie*, 6.1: col. 1514.
Von Reden, S. 1995. *Exchange in Ancient Greece*. London.
2010. *Money in Classical Antiquity*. Cambridge.
2012. "Glanz der Stadt und Glanz der Bürger. Stiftungen in der Antike," *GWU*, 63: 21–36.
Von Schirnding, A. and E. G. Schmidt (eds.). 2002. *Hesiod. Theogonie, Werke und Tage*. Düsseldorf.
Von Steuben, H. 1980. *Kopf eines Kuros*. Frankfurt am Main.
Von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. 1887. "Demotika der attischen Metoeken. II," *Hermes* 22: 211–59.
(ed.). 1928. *Hesiodos Erga*. Berlin.
Vuolanto, V. 2002. "Male and Female Euergetism in Late Antiquity," in P. Setälä et al. (eds.), *Women, Wealth and Power in the Roman Empire*. Rome: 245–302.
Wade-Gery, H. T. 1932–1933. "The Prytaneion Decree," *ABSA*, 33: 123–7.
1958. *Essays in Greek History*. Oxford.
Wagner-Hasel, B. 1998. "Geschenke," in Cancik and Schneider (eds.), *Der Neue Pauly*, vol. 4: 984–8.
2000. *Der Stoff der Gaben. Kultur und Politik des Schenkens und Tauschens im archaischen Griechenland*. Frankfurt and New York.
Walbank, M. B. 1978. *Athenian Proxenies of the Fifth Century B.C.* Toronto and Sarasota.
Walker, H. J. 1995. *Theseus and Athens*. Oxford.
Walker, K. G. 2004. *Archaic Eretria. A Political and Social History from the Earliest Times to 490 BC*. London.
Wallace, M. B. 1970. "Early Greek Proxenoi," *Phoenix*, 24: 189–208.
Wallace, R. W. 2009. "Charismatic Leaders," in Raaflaub and van Wees (eds.), 411–26.
Wallace-Hadrill, A. (ed.). 1989. *Patronage in Ancient Society*. London and New York.
Wallinga, H. T. 2000. "The Athenian Naukraroi," in Sancisi-Weerdenburg (ed.), 131–46.
Walter, U. 1993. *An der Polis teilhaben. Bürgerstaat und Zugehörigkeit im Archaischen Griechenland*. Stuttgart.
Wecowski, M. 2009. "Greece in the Making and the Polis," *Palamedes*, 4: 167–76.
2014. *The Rise of the Greek Aristocratic Banquet*. Oxford.
Weeber, K.-W. 1991. *Die unheiligen Spiele. Das antike Olympia zwischen Legende und Wirklichkeit*. Munich and Zurich.

Welles, C. B. 1934. *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period: A Study in Greek Epigraphy*. New Haven.
Welwei, K.-W. 1970. "Die 'Marathon'-Epigramme von der athenischen Agora," *Historia*, 19: 295–305.
1998². *Die griechische Polis. Verfassung und Gesellschaft in archaischer und klassischer Zeit*. Stuttgart.
2001. "Proxenia, Proxenos," in Cancik and Schneider (eds.), *Der Neue Pauly*, vol. 10: col. 476.
West, M. L. (ed.). 1978. *Hesiod. Works and Days*. Edited with Prolegomena and Commentary. Oxford.
1992. *Ancient Greek Music*. Oxford.
Whitehead, D. 1983. "Competitive Outlay and Community Profit: Philotimia in Democratic Athens," *C&M*, 34: 55–74.
1986. *The Demes of Attica, 508/7–ca. 250 B.C. A Political and Social Study*. Princeton.
1991. "The Lampadephoroi of Aiantis Again," *ZPE*, 87: 42–4.
Wiemer, H.-U. 2013: "Hellenistic Cities: The End of Greek Democracy?" in Beck (ed.), 54–69.
Wiesehöfer, J. 1980. "Die 'Freunde' und 'Wohltäter' des Großkönigs," *Studia Iranica*, 9: 7–21.
Wilhelm, A. 1942. *Attische Urkunden. V. Teil*. Vienna and Leipzig.
Will, E. 1972. *Le monde grec et l'Orient*. Paris.
Will, W. 2003. *Thukydides und Perikles. Der Historiker und sein Held*. Bonn.
Willemsen, F. 1963. "Archaische Grabmalbasen aus der Athener Stadtmauer," *MDAI (A)*, 78: 104–53.
Wilson, P. 2000. *The Athenian Institution of the Khoregia. The Chorus, the City and the Stage*. Cambridge.
2009. "Tragic Honours and Democracy: Neglected Evidence for the Politics of the Athenian Dionysia," *CQ*, 59: 8–29.
Wohl, V. 1996. "*Eusebeias eneka kai philotimias*. Hegemony and Democracy at the Panathenaia," *C&M*, 47: 25–88.
Wolff, C. 2010. *Sparta und die peloponnesische Staatenwelt in archaischer und klassischer Zeit*. Munich.
Wolpert, A. 2002. *Remembering Defeat. Civil War and Civic Memory in Ancient Athens*. Baltimore.
Woodard, R. D. (ed.). 2007. *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Mythology*. Cambridge.
Wörrle, M. 1975. "Antiochos I., Achaios der Ältere und die Galater. Eine neue Inschrift in Denizli," *Chiron*, 5: 59–87.
1977. "Epigraphische Forschungen zur Geschichte Lykiens I," *Chiron*, 7: 43–66.
1988. *Stadt und Fest im kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasien. Studien zu einer agonistischen Stiftung aus Oinoanda*. Munich.
Worthington, I. 1992. *A Historical Commentary on Dinarchus. Rhetoric and Conspiracy in Later Fourth-Century Athens*. Ann Arbor.
(ed.). 1994. *Persuasion. Greek Rhetoric in Action*. London and New York.

(ed.). 2007. *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric*. Oxford.
2013. *Demosthenes of Athens and the Fall of Classical Greece*. Oxford.
C. Cooper, and E. M. Harris (trans.). 2001. *Dinarchus, Hyperides, and Lycurgus*. Austin.
Wycherley, R. E. 1957. *The Athenian Agora III: Literary and Epigraphical Testimonia*. Princeton.
1992. "Rebuilding in Athens and Attica," in Lewis et al. (eds.), 206–22.
Wyse, W. 1904. *The Speeches of Isaeus*. Cambridge.
Yon, J.-B. 2001. "Euergetism and Urbanism in Palmyra," in L. Lavan (ed.), *Recent Research in Late Antique Urbanism*. Portsmouth, RI: 173–81.
Young, D. C. 1984. *The Olympic Myth of Greek Amateur Athletics*. Chicago.
Young, P. H. 1980. *Building Projects and Archaic Greek Tyrants*. Diss. Pennsylvania.
Yunis, H. (ed.). 2001. *Demosthenes. On the Crown*. Cambridge.
Zanetto, G. and D. Del Corno (eds.). 1987. *Aristofane. Gli uccelli*. Milan.
Zanker, P. 1995. *The Mask of Socrates. The Image of the Intellectual in Antiquity*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and Oxford.
Zelnick-Abramovitz, R. 2013. *Taxing Freedom in Thessalian Manumission Inscriptions*. Leiden.
Zimmermann, B. 2008^2. *Dithyrambos. Geschichte einer Gattung*. Berlin.
Zimmermann, M. 1992. *Untersuchungen zur historischen Landeskunde Zentrallykiens*. Bonn.
Zuiderhoek, A. 2009. *The Politics of Munificence in the Roman Empire. Citizens, Elites, and Benefactors in Asia Minor*. Cambridge.
2011. "Oligarchs and Benefactors. Elite Demography and Euergetism in the Greek East of the Roman Empire," in Van Nijf and Alston (eds.), 185–96.

The index of literary sources

Aelian
VH 6. 10: 156
VH 9. 25: 93, 103
fr. 68: 156
Aeschines
1. 39: 156
1. 101–2: 200
1. 101: 200
1. 112: 225
2. 13: 238
2. 17: 238
2. 45–6: 238
2. 53: 238
2. 80: 228
2. 121: 238
3. 11–12: 222, 226
3. 17: 209, 246
3. 27: 209
3. 31–2: 222
3. 31: 226
3. 43–5: 222
3. 51: 210
3. 77: 39, 226
3. 83: 238
3. 143: 198, 244
3. 178–82: 176
3. 178–9: 242
3. 179–80: 227
3. 182: 71
3. 183: 176
3. 184–5: 177
3. 186: 169
3. 187–90: 244
3. 187: 188, 189
3. 190: 189
3. 236: 39, 43
3. 243: 196, 197, 198, 244,
3. 258: 110, 177
3. 259: 77
Agaclytus
FGrH 411 F 1: 101
Alcaeus
fr. 129. 67 Voigt: 96
Alcman
PMG 1: 81
Andocides and ps.-Andocides
1. 38: 168
1. 45: 184, 188, 237, 244
1. 96–8: 190, 245
1. 112: 189
1. 115: 189
1. 132: 173
1. 147: 78
2. 10–12: 244
2. 10: 186
2. 11–12: 186
2. 17–18: 185, 187, 244
2. 18: 184, 243
2. 19: 197
4. 31: 133
4. 32: 136
4. 41: 212
4. 42: 79
Androtion
FGrH 324 F 6: 128
FGrH 324 F 36: 81
FGrH 324 F 59: 144
Anecdota Graeca, ed. I. Bekker
p. 283. 20–1: 82
Antiphanes
fr. 202 K–A: 202
Apellas
FGrH 266 F 5: 101
Appendix Proverbiorum
2. 66: 98
Apsines
10. 6 (198 Dilts–Kennedy): 125, 228
Archilochus
fr. 19.3 West^2: 91
Aristophanes
Av. 1021: 52
Eq. 50–2: 161

Eq. 255: 161
Eq. 280–3: 181, 243
Eq. 573–6: 181, 243
Eq. 573–80: 133
Eq. 576–80: 181
Eq. 702: 181, 243
Eq. 797–800: 161
Eq. 1225–54: 182, 184, 243
Ra. 1063–8: 150
Aristotle and ps.-Aristotle
Ath. 3. 1: 75
Ath. 7. 3–4: 75
Ath. 8. 3: 81
Ath. 15: 92
Ath. 16. 2: 93, 103, 142
Ath. 16. 4: 82, 98
Ath. 16. 6: 82
Ath. 16. 9: 93, 103
Ath. 18. 1–3: 165
Ath. 18. 2–3: 102
Ath. 18. 2: 165
Ath. 19. 1: 163
Ath. 22. 4: 128
Ath. 26. 4: 156
Ath. 27. 2–3: 140, 154, 249
Ath. 27. 3–4: 55
Ath. 27. 3: 77, 98
Ath. 27. 4: 156
Ath. 29. 4: 113
Ath. 38. 3–4: 190
Ath. 40. 2: 191
Ath. 46. 1: 226
Ath. 55. 5: 77
Ath. 56–8: 162
Ath. 56. 3: 200
Ath. 58. 1: 163
EE 1243^{a}15–17: 34
EN 1120^{b}24–7: 98
EN 1124^{b}9–18: 147
EN 1132^{b}–1133^{b}: 34
EN 1167^{a}14–16: 29
Oec. 1346^{a}32–1346^{b}2: 98
Oec. 1346^{b}7–9: 97
Oec. 1346^{b}9–12: 97
Oec. 1347^{a}11–14: 80, 83, 98
Oec. 1347^{b}7–9: 96
Pol. 1278^{a}34: 156
Pol. 1284^{a}26: 96
Pol. 1301^{a}29–31: 146
Pol. 1304^{a}9–10: 110
Pol. 1304^{a}29–31: 93
Pol. 1305^{a}25–6: 93
Pol. 1305^{a}40–2: 96
Pol. 1309^{a}14–19: 201
Pol. 1309^{a}18–21: 204
Pol. 1311^{a}20–2: 96
Pol. 1313^{a}40: 96
Pol. 1313^{b}22: 101
Pol. 1313^{b}23: 100
Pol. 1315^{b}27–8: 93
Pol. 1321^{a}32–41: 248
Rh. 1397^{b}27–30: 196, 197, 244
Rh. 1411^{b}6–7: 197, 244
Rhet. Al. 1446^{b}36–8: 29
fr. 637 Rose: 102
Astydamas
TrGF 60 T 2a–b: 125, 229
Athenaeus
1. 3d: 193
11. 506b: 178
12. 532 f–3 c: 55, 77
13. 603 f: 110

Bacchylides
3. 10–21: 94
3. 63–6: 95
10: 136
13. 67 ff.: 69, 120
Baton of Sinope
FGrH 268 F 3: 97, 102

Callimachus
frr. 84–5 Pfeiffer: 115, 121, 122, 126
Callinus
fr. 1 West^{2}: 86
Cicero
Leg. 2. 64–5: 96
Leg. 2. 66: 96
Clearchus of Soli
fr. 44 Wehrli: 101
Conon
FGrH 26 F 1: 103
Cratinus
fr. 1 K–A: 140, 249

Democritus
68 B 255 D–K: 78
Demosthenes and ps.-Demosthenes
1. 8–9: 201, 247
1. 13: 202
1. 17: 202
1. 36: 79
1. 147: 78
2. 24: 200
8. 21–3: 200
8. 70–71: 219
8. 70: 212
12. 10: 194
13. 21–2: 40, 169
13. 21: 166

Demosthenes and ps.-Demosthenes (cont.)
13. 22–3: 241
14. 25: 200
18: 39, 226
18. 4: 242
18. 79–83: 242
18. 86–8: 242
18. 93–4: 242
18. 99: 203
18. 102: 201, 242, 247
18. 107 ff.: 215
18. 107: 242
18. 108: 242
18. 112–13: 208, 242, 246
18. 114: 210, 211, 224, 246, 249
18. 117–19: 208, 246
18. 117: 242
18. 119: 242
18. 120–1: 222
18. 171: 205
18. 222: 242
18. 257: 242
18. 268: 212
18. 269: 28
18. 297–9: 242
18. 298–303: 242
18. 299: 208, 246
18. 311–12: 242
18. 311: 208, 246
18. 312: 205
18. 316: 242
18. 319–20: 224
19. 31: 238
19. 40: 212
19. 139–40: 77
19. 145: 77
19. 166–71: 212
19. 166–8: 77
19. 234: 238
19. 264–6: 77
19. 273: 77
20. 1: 200
20. 6: 241
20. 18: 79, 150
20. 21–2: 79
20. 21: 173, 229
20. 29: 150
20. 35: 43, 44
20. 39: 241
20. 54: 241
20. 57: 241
20. 64: 38
20. 68 ff.: 241
20. 69: 193
20. 70: 126, 164, 192, 193, 241, 244
20. 71: 193
20. 72: 193
20. 74: 241
20. 75: 197, 244
20. 77: 198
20. 79: 197, 244
20. 81: 241
20. 82: 241
20. 86: 197, 244
20. 100: 25
20. 103: 221
20. 112–16: 40, 169
20. 112: 241
20. 114: 241
20. 115–17: 241
20. 115: 41, 177
20. 119: 241
20. 120–4: 228
20. 120: 241
20. 121–2: 242
20. 127–30: 162, 244
20. 127 ff.: 150
20. 141: 227
20. 142: 241
20. 146: 197, 198, 244
20. 154–5: 222
20. 155: 221
20. 159: 150, 162, 190, 244, 245
21. 13: 79, 203
21. 55: 172
21. 61: 201, 247
21. 62: 244
21. 64: 172
21. 151: 218
21. 153: 219
21. 154–5: 200
21. 154: 219
21. 156: 200, 203
21. 157: 219
21. 161–5: 206
21. 161: 206
21. 165: 207
21. 215: 233
22. 5: 225, 245
22. 8: 225, 226, 245
22. 36–7: 225, 245
22. 72: 192, 244
23. 130: 244
23. 136: 244
23. 145: 210
23. 188: 210
23. 196–203: 40
23. 196–9: 241
23. 196: 166, 169
23. 197: 41

23. 198: 41
23. 199–200: 41
24. 180: 192, 197, 244
24. 197–8: 201, 247
28. 7: 200
28. 17: 201, 202, 247
28. 22–4: 200
36. 41: 200
38. 26: 201, 203, 247
39. 7: 79
42: 200
42. 1: 80, 83, 98
42. 22–3: 200
42. 25: 217
45. 66: 200
45. 69–70: 78
45. 78: 203
45. 85: 200, 203
47. 54: 201, 202, 247
50. 7: 202
50. 8–9: 201, 247
50. 9: 201
50. 13: 202, 237, 244
51: 174
51. 5–6: 175
52. 26: 201, 247
53. 9: 202
53. 12–13: 202
Ep. 3. 6: 213
Dinarchus
1. 13: 138
1. 14: 193
1. 40: 77
1. 43: 77, 125, 228
1. 80: 205
1. 101: 86, 125, 228
3. 2: 77
Diodorus Siculus
9. 2. 5: 89
9. 37: 98
11. 25. 1: 102
11. 26. 7: 102
11. 27. 3: 43, 172
11. 58. 1: 167
12. 2: 188
12. 9. 2 ff.: 97
12. 9. 2–3: 93, 96
13. 38. 45: 134
13. 47. 7: 201, 247
13. 47. 52: 201, 247
13. 69: 183, 184
13. 82: 121
14. 82. 2 ff.: 193
14. 83. 5–7: 192
14. 84. 4 ff.: 193
14. 91. 2–3: 196
15. 33. 4: 197, 244
15. 36. 5: 198
20. 82. 2–3: 48
20. 100. 1: 43
Diogenes Laertius
1. 53: 82, 98
1. 55: 67, 89
1. 56: 89
1. 89: 102
1. 96: 96
2. 43: 125, 229
Dionysius of Halicarnassus
Ant. Rom. 7. 3–11: 93
Lys. 12. 5: 196
Duris of Samos
FGrH 76 F 63: 81, 103

Ephorus
FGrH 70 F 178: 96
Epicharmus
fr. 211 K–A ap. [Pl.] *Ax.* 366c: 27, 29
Euripides and ps.-Euripides
Andr. 693–702: 184
Andr. 1103: 52
Ion 551: 52
Ion 1039: 52
Rh. 399–412: 113
fr. 282. 13–28 ap. Ath. 10. 413c ff.: 85, 135
PMG 755 ap. Ath. 1. 3e: 123, 136
Eusebius
Ol. 53. 3, p. 102^{b}4–5: 102

Gorgias
82 B 20 D–K ap. Plu. *Cim.* 10. 5: 140, 154, 249
Gorgon
FGrH 515 F 18: 120

Harpocration
s.v. "Epikrates": 125, 228
Heraclides
FHG ii. 213, fr. 5: 96
FHG ii. 222, fr. 32. 1: 103
Herodotus
1. 14: 101
1. 22: 113
1. 41: 27
1. 54: 44, 55, 61
1. 59–60: 93
1. 61–4: 92
1. 64: 96, 98
1. 64. 1: 82
1. 69–70: 29, 113
1. 70: 33
3. 39: 96, 101

Herodotus (cont.)
3. 60: 99, 101
3. 120: 93
3. 139–40: 30
3. 140: 34
3. 142: 101
4. 164: 96
5. 44–5: 61
5. 55: 162, 163
5. 62: 76, 84
5. 63: 113
5. 67: 102, 103
5. 70–1: 90
5. 71 ff.: 134
5. 71: 81
5. 83: 81
5. 90–1: 113
5. 92: 96, 97
5. 102: 134
6. 22: 96
6. 36: 134
6. 103: 96, 135
6. 108. 4: 100
6. 123: 163, 164, 165
6. 126: 102
6. 128: 102
7. 107: 176, 177
7. 111: 113
7. 139: 159
7. 197. 2: 79
8. 11: 171
8. 85: 109
8. 120: 113
8. 123: 171
8. 124: 172
8. 124. 2: 172
8. 136: 44, 52, 108, 110
8. 143: 52
9. 73: 61
9. 85: 109
9. 105: 128
Hesiod
Op. 320 ff.: 31
Op. 349–51: 33, 35
Op. 353–5: 29
Op. 356–60: 30, 31
Op. 357–8: 31
Op. 359–60: 31
Op. 364 ff.: 31
fr. 37 M–W: 62
Homer, *Il.*
4. 476–7: 74
6. 192–5: 61
6. 194: 61
6. 219–20: 32, 33, 36
6. 234–6: 32, 35
6. 314: 74
7. 287–305: 32, 34
9. 574–9: 62
11. 625–7: 62
12. 310–12: 62
12. 316–17: 62
17. 248–50: 62
17. 301–3: 74
18. 550 ff.: 74
20. 184–6: 62
Homer, *Od.*
1. 309–13: 30
2. 127: 74
4. 592: 30
8. 431: 30
13. 1–15: 74
15. 54: 30
18. 288: 74
18. 365 ff.: 74
19. 109 ff.: 74
21. 31–5: 32, 33
23. 189 ff.: 74
24. 283–6: 28, 30, 32
Hyperides
1. 17: 211
2. 4–6: 226
5. 25: 77
6. 10: 77
frr. 104–6 Jensen: 125, 229

Ibycus
fr. 282 B Campbell = *SLG* 220–6: 69, 90
Isaeus
2. 47–9: 200
4. 27: 247
4. 29: 200
5. 35–7: 200
5. 35: 200
5. 36–8: 21, 25
5. 37: 205
5. 41: 200
5. 47: 86, 162
6. 38: 200
6. 60–1: 247
7. 38: 200, 203
7. 40: 200, 247
8. 10: 156
11. 47: 200
Isocrates
4. 1–2: 85, 136
4. 27: 201
4. 67 ff.: 159
4. 142: 194
6. 60–1: 201

7. 31–6: 144
7. 32: 78
7. 35: 200
7. 40: 201
7. 53–5: 201
8. 12: 215
8. 128: 150, 200, 201, 247
9. 51: 195
9. 54: 194, 195
9. 55: 195
9. 57: 192, 196, 244
10. 57: 138
12. 12: 201, 247
12. 145: 201, 247
15: 200
15. 94: 224, 244
15. 145: 200, 203
15. 158: 200
15. 159: 202, 216
15. 160: 200, 201, 247
15. 166: 110
16. 11: 183
16. 28: 171
16. 32: 153
16. 35: 55, 153
16. 49: 133
18. 59–60: 150
18. 61: 55, 187, 244
18. 65: 192, 194, 244, 245
18. 66: 43

Justin
Epit. 5. 4. 9–11: 183
Epit. 5. 4. 14: 183

Lucian
Deor. Conc. 12: 121, 122
Lycurgus
1. 51: 125, 131
1. 86: 61
1. 117: 128, 137
1. 125–7: 190
1. 127: 245
1. 138–40: 37
1. 139: 213
fr. 9 Conomis = 14 Burtt = 8 Durrbach: 125, 178, 184, 228
Lysias
2. 24: 200
4. 1: 83
7. 31–2: 201, 247
7. 31: 203
14. 31: 183, 184
16. 14: 78
18. 3: 201, 247
18. 7: 200
18. 61: 56
19. 9: 201, 247
19. 25: 202
19. 29: 200, 201, 203, 247
19. 57–9: 201, 247
19. 57: 200
19. 59: 78
19. 63: 203
20. 19: 39
20. 23: 150
21. 1 ff.: 175
21. 3: 173
21. 5: 203
21. 11: 43, 183
21. 12: 150, 200
21. 19: 79
25. 12: 155, 200
25. 13: 56, 203
25. 15: 218
26. 22: 201, 247
28. 3: 200, 201, 247
29. 4: 200, 201, 203, 247
29. 7: 207
30. 1: 218
30. 26: 200, 247
32. 23: 200
fr. 7. 171–5 Carey: 43
fr. 49 Carey: 197
fr. 70. 171–9 Carey: 183
fr. 104 Carey: 150
fr. 286. 2 Carey: 113

Marcellinus
Vit. Thuc. 3: 102

Nepos
2. 10. 3: 167
3. 3: 177
5. 4: 140
7. 6: 183, 184
8. 4. 1: 189, 244
12. 1: 197, 244
13. 2. 3: 192, 198, 244
Nicolaus of Damascus
FGrH 90 F 52: 103
FGrH 90 F 57: 96, 97

Pausanias
1. 1. 2: 167
1. 1. 3: 193
1. 3. 2: 192, 195, 198, 244
1. 14. 1: 100
1. 15. 3: 71, 168
1. 18. 3: 126, 130, 165

Pausanias (cont.)
1. 19: 100
1. 20. 3: 100
1. 21. 1–2: 125, 229
1. 21. 2: 229
1. 23. 9: 127, 137
1. 23. 10: 128
1. 24. 3: 197
1. 24. 7: 196
1. 25. 1: 167
1. 28. 1: 68, 90, 115
1. 28. 2: 167
1. 40. 1: 102
1. 41. 2: 102
1. 44. 1: 134
2. 9. 6: 97, 102
2. 19. 7: 115
3. 13. 9: 68, 115, 126
5. 2. 3: 101
5. 21. 1: 117
5. 25. 1: 117
6. 3. 8: 114
6. 3. 16: 193, 194, 198
6. 5. 7: 119, 121, 122
6. 6. 1: 127
6. 7. 1 ff.: 134
6. 7. 3: 120
6. 8. 5: 115, 119, 126
6. 9. 3: 115, 126
6. 9. 6–8: 121
6. 11. 2–9: 114, 121, 126
6. 11. 6–9: 122
6. 11. 8: 121
6. 11. 9: 121
6. 13. 1: 115
6. 13. 2: 68, 119, 120
6. 13. 11: 138
6. 15. 6: 119
6. 15. 8: 68
6. 16. 6: 134
6. 17. 2: 119
6. 18. 7: 68
7. 17. 5: 120
7. 17. 13–14: 114, 122
7. 27. 5: 115, 119, 126
8. 40. 1: 55, 67, 90, 126, 137
9. 32. 8: 130
10. 9. 2: 119
10. 10. 1: 170
10. 13. 5: 101
Pherecydes
FGrH 3 F 2: 102
Philochorus
FGrH 328 F 49: 206
Photius
β 264: 100
κ 1280: 96
ν 39: 83
Pindar
I. 1. 41–5: 65
I. 1. 43: 70
I. 1. 44–7: 71
I. 1. 50–1: 70
I. 3. 13: 64
I. 4: 72
I. 4. 7–8: 109
I. 4. 19–23: 72
I. 8. 1–5: 69, 120
N. 2: 65, 136
N. 3. 6–8: 70
N. 3. 65–7: 70
N. 3. 67–8: 64
N. 7. 65: 109
N. 8. 46–8: 70
O. 2. 92–5: 95
O. 5. 1–4: 64
O. 5. 8: 64
O. 5. 17–22: 64
O. 7: 120
O. 8. 20: 64
O. 9: 72
O. 9. 83: 109
P. 1. 89–90: 95
P. 2: 72
P. 2. 58–86: 95
P. 7: 65, 86, 136
P. 7. 9–12: 76
P. 9. 73–5: 64
P. 9. 74: 69, 120
P. 9. 93–6: 65
Plato and ps.-Plato
Ap. 36d–e: 133, 136
Ap. 36d: 85
Def. 414a: 29
Grg. 472a: 55, 152
Hipparch. 229b–c: 165
La. 179c–d: 177
Men. 90a: 98
R. 465d: 85
R. 468b: 171
Smp. 220d: 171
Pliny the Elder
Nat. 7. 152: 115, 119, 121, 122, 126
Nat. 34. 16: 117
Nat. 34. 17: 86, 137
Nat. 34. 19: 129
Nat. 34. 74: 167
Nat. 35. 57: 168

Plutarch and ps.-Plutarch
Alc. 7: 171
Alc. 11. 2: 123
Alc. 16: 55
Alc. 16. 3: 55, 152
Alc. 32: 183
Alc. 32. 4: 183
Alc. 33: 184
Alc. 33. 2: 183, 243
Alc. 33. 3: 183
Arist. 27. 1: 177
Arist. 27. 2: 177
Cim. 4. 5–6: 169
Cim. 7: 176, 177
Cim. 8: 169
Cim. 10: 140
Cim. 10. 3–5: 55
Cim. 10. 7: 154
Cim. 13. 7–8: 142, 143, 249
Dem. 1. 1: 123
Lyc. 22. 4–5: 69
Lys. 1: 96
Nic. 3. 1–2: 154
Nic. 3. 2: 152
Nic. 3. 4–5: 152
Nic. 3–4: 55
Per. 9: 140
Per. 9. 2–3: 156
Per. 11–14: 144
Per. 12. 3–4: 158
Per. 12. 4: 158
Per. 12. 5–6: 158
Per. 14: 55
Per. 14. 1–2: 145
Per. 37: 156
Rom. 28: 121
Sol. 2. 1: 77
Sol. 12: 81, 90
Sol. 23: 132
Sol. 23. 3: 55, 67, 89
Sol. 24. 3: 55, 67
Sol. 31. 2: 103
Them. 5: 143
Them. 5. 3: 172
Them. 7: 171
Them. 22: 143
Them. 22. 2: 166
Them. 24: 108
Them. 32. 3: 167
Mor. 164a: 101
Mor. 180a: 125
Mor. 400d–f: 101
Mor. 400e: 101
Mor. 639e: 69, 121
Mor. 723c: 120
Mor. 724b: 101
Mor. 832f: 207
Mor. 841b: 213
Mor. 841d: 213, 247
Mor. 841e: 213
Mor. 841f: 125, 229
Mor. 842f: 213, 247
Mor. 843c: 213
Mor. 843f: 247, 249
Mor. 843f–4a: 125, 213, 228
Mor. 844a: 210
Mor. 845f: 209
Mor. 845f–6a: 209, 246
Mor. 849f: 206
Mor. 850b–1f: 43
Mor. 850f–1c: 209
Mor. 850f: 206, 207, 209, 210
Mor. 851a: 212
Mor. 852a–d: 212
Mor. 852b: 213
Polemon
fr. 89 Preller: 110
Pollux
8. 108: 81
Polyaenus
1. 23: 96

Scholia
on Alc. fr. 114. 306 g 9–13: 96
on Ar. *Av.* 1541: 81
on Ar. *Nu.* 37: 81
on Ar. *Nu.* 64: 128
on Aristid. (Dindorf III. 323): 102
on Aristid. (Dindorf III. 446): 140
on Aristid. (Dindorf III. 17): 140
on Aristid. (Dindorf III. 535): 166
on D. 20. 21: 79
on D. 21. 62: 192, 196, 244
on Hom. *Il* 6. 194: 61
on Pi. *N.* 9: 103
on Pi. *O.* 7. 152d: 103
Simonides
fr. 131 Bergk = *FGE* 684–7 = *CEG* 430: 162, 244
FGE 792–5: 173
PMG 510: 69
Solon
fr. 107 Ruschenbusch: 80
fr. 32 West^2: 96
fr. 33.5–6 West^2: 97
Strabo
6. 20: 101
8. 3. 30: 101

Strabo (cont.)
8. 6. 20: 96
9. 1. 19: 213
Suda
σ 1711: 98
Suetonius
Nero 25: 121

Theognis
573–4: 30
Theophrastus
fr. 515 Fortenbaugh ap. Cic. *Off.* 2. 64: 140
Theopompus
FGrH 115 F 89 and F 135 ap. Ath. 12. 532f–3c: 140, 154, 249
Thucydides
1. 73. 1–2: 159
1. 98: 176, 177
1. 101.3: 148
1. 126–7: 81
1. 126: 90
1. 129: 109
1. 136: 108
1. 137: 27
1. 138. 5: 167
2. 13: 156
2. 13. 3: 148
2. 15. 5: 100
2. 29. 1: 110
2. 35 ff.: 151
2. 40. 4: 31, 146
2. 63. 2: 160
2. 85. 5–6: 110
3. 2. 3: 52, 110
3. 4. 4: 110
3. 8: 134
3. 70. 1: 52
4. 27–9: 181
4. 37–41: 181
4. 121. 1: 184
5. 43. 2: 109
5. 89: 159
6. 12. 2: 152, 153
6. 16 ff.: 134
6. 16: 185
6. 16. 1–3: 55
6. 16. 2–3: 153
6. 16. 3–4: 155
6. 16. 3: 55, 152
6. 31. 3: 174
6. 53: 163, 164
6. 54. 1–3: 165
6. 54. 5: 98, 100
6. 54. 6–7: 100
6. 56–8: 102
6. 56: 162
6. 56. 1: 165
6. 60: 188
6. 82. 1: 159
6. 83. 1: 159
8. 35: 134
8. 84: 134
8. 92. 8: 110
Tyrtaeus
fr. 12 West²: 85, 90, 135

Valerius Maximus
2. 6. 5: 178, 184
Vitruvius
9. praef.: 120

Xenophanes
fr. 2 West²: 55, 90, 132, 133, 135, 137
fr. 2. 1–11 West²: 66
fr. 2. 11–22 West²: 84
fr. 3 West²: 87
Xenophon and ps.-Xenophon, 109
An. 7. 3. 20: 33
An. 7. 7. 46: 113
Ap. 16: 32, 146
Ath. 1. 13: 80, 82, 150, 201
Ath. 2. 9–10: 161
Cyr. 5. 3. 31: 29
Cyr. 5. 3. 32: 35, 41
Cyr. 5. 4. 32: 32, 146
Cyr. 8. 17–20: 36
HG 1. 1. 2 ff.: 134
HG 1. 4. 11–12: 183
HG 1. 4. 13: 183
HG 1. 4. 20: 183, 185
HG 1. 5. 12: 134
HG 1. 5. 19: 134
HG 1. 33: 185, 243
HG 2. 3. 8: 43
HG 2. 3. 40: 207
HG 2. 4. 2 ff.: 244
HG 4. 1. 39: 32
HG 4. 3. 11ff.: 192
HG 4. 5. 7: 196
HG 4. 8: 194
HG 4. 8. 1–9: 193
HG 4. 8. 2: 194
HG 5. 4. 62–6: 198
HG 6. 2. 1: 201, 247
HG 6. 4. 19–20: 239
Hiero 8. 7: 95
Mem. 3. 6. 3: 204

Oec. 2. 6: 216, 247
Oec. 2. 7: 202
Oec. 7. 3: 200
Poroi 3. 3: 245
Smp. 4. 30–2: 201, 247
Smp. 4. 30: 150
Smp. 4. 45: 201
Vect. 3. 3–4: 220
Vect. 3. 8: 215

Zenobius
4. 76: 98

The index of inscriptions

Agora
XV 1–25: 225
XV 1: 245
XV 49: 226
XVI 52: 189

Bousquet 1986, 22–4: 37, 47, 56
Bringmann and von Steuben 1995
93 [E 1]: 42, 45, 54, 71
93 [E 2]: 42, 54, 71
284 [E 1]: 38, 39, 42, 45, 54
284 [E 2]: 42
286 [E]: 42

CEG
2: 176

Daly 2007, 240–5: 39
Dubois 2002
5: 67, 90, 132

Hedrick 1988, 113: 232
Herrmann 1965a, 33–6: 38, 39, 41, 45
Herrmann 1965b, 73–4: 38, 39, 42, 45, 54

I. Cret.
IV 64: 44, 59, 63, 108
I. Delos
88: 236
I. Ephesos
5, 1453: 38, 49
I. Erythrai
6: 193, 194
30: 47
31: 47
504: 47
I. Ilion
33: 50
I. Kyme
13: 43, 54

I. Olympia
144: 117, 119
145: 118
146: 119, 127
147: 118
148: 118
149: 118
150: 118
169: 138
I. Smyrna
573: 56
697: 22
IG
I³ 11: 237
I³ 18a–b: 110
I³ 19: 110
I³ 20: 110
I³ 23a–b: 110
I³ 24: 110
I³ 27a: 110
I³ 28a: 110
I³ 28b: 110
I³ 30: 110
I³ 43: 237
I³ 49: 55, 145, 156
I³ 55: 110
I³ 63: 237
I³ 65: 110, 138
I³ 66: 237
I³ 71: 110
I³ 73: 110
I³ 73a–b: 110
I³ 73a–b + 97: 110
I³ 74: 110
I³ 79: 214
I³ 80: 110
I³ 81: 110
I³ 82: 173
I³ 85: 237
I³ 91: 110, 236, 237
I³ 92: 110

I³ 97: 110
I³ 98: 110
I³ 101: 237
I³ 102: 110, 111, 184, 188
I³ 106: 110, 237
I³ 107: 110, 111, 236, 237
I³ 110: 110, 236, 237
I³ 113: 194, 195
I³ 114a: 110
I³ 117: 110
I³ 118: 110, 237, 239
I³ 123: 237, 239
I³ 125: 111, 184
I³ 126: 110
I³ 127: 236, 237, 239
I³ 131: 86, 132, 137, 162, 179, 181, 243, 244
I³ 149: 237
I³ 156: 110
I³ 159: 110
I³ 160: 110
I³ 161: 110
I³ 162: 110
I³ 163: 110, 236, 237
I³ 164a: 110
I³ 164b: 110
I³ 165: 236, 237
I³ 165a: 110
I³ 166: 110
I³ 167: 110, 236, 237
I³ 168: 110
I³ 169: 237
I³ 169, p952: 236
I³ 170: 110, 111
I³ 173: 110
I³ 174: 110
I³ 175: 110
I³ 177: 110
I³ 178: 110
I³ 179: 110
I³ 180: 237
I³ 180a: 110
I³ 181: 110
I³ 182: 110, 138
I³ 182 bis: 110, 237
I³ 203a: 110
I³ 204: 110
I³ 227: 110
I³ 228: 110
I³ 229: 110
I³ 242: 232
I³ 243 fr. 10: 232
I³ 244: 232
I³ 245: 232
I³ 248: 232
I³ 250: 232
I³ 251: 232
I³ 253: 232
I³ 254: 232
I³ 256: 232
I³ 258: 232
I³ 375: 190
I³ 503: 176
I³ 504: 176
I³ 823: 119
I³ 826: 127
I³ 833 bis: 173
I³ 835: 128
I³ 847: 127
I³ 880: 127
I³ 881: 128
I³ 884: 167
I³ 893: 127
I³ 948: 100
I³ 951: 131
I³ 969 bis, b: 173
I³ 1154: 110
I³ 1357: 59
II² 1: 237, 239
II² 2: 237
II² 6: 110, 236, 237
II² 10: 189, 192
II² 13: 237
II² 13b: 236
II² 17: 110, 234, 236, 237
II² 18: 110
II² 19: 236, 237
II² 19b: 236
II² 20: 194, 195
II² 21: 236, 237
II² 22: 236
II² 24: 239
II² 34: 239
II² 40: 236, 237, 239, 244
II² 41: 239
II² 42: 239
II² 43: 198
II² 51: 236
II² 53: 236
II² 54: 236
II² 63: 110
II² 66c: 110
II² 69: 236
II² 70: 237, 244
II² 78: 239
II² 95: 236
II² 102: 234, 239
II² 107: 234, 239
II² 110: 236
II² 116: 239
II² 124: 239

IG (cont.)
II² 127: 239
II² 132: 236
II² 133: 236
II² 141: 239
II² 172: 110
II² 182: 236
II² 187: 110
II² 188: 236
II² 193: 236
II² 457: 209
II² 682: 39, 43
II² 907: 39
II² 1138: 232
II² 1140: 232
II² 1141: 232
II² 1142: 232
II² 1143: 232
II² 1144: 232
II² 1145: 232
II² 1146: 232
II² 1147: 232
II² 1148: 232
II² 1149: 232
II² 1150: 232
II² 1151: 232
II² 1173: 232, 248
II² 1178: 232, 248
II² 1179: 232, 248
II² 1182: 232, 248
II² 1191: 214
II² 1250: 173
II² 1496: 183, 210, 224
II² 1623: 207
II² 1656: 193
II² 1657: 193
II² 1658: 193
II² 1659: 193
II² 1660: 193
II² 1661: 193
II² 1662: 193
II² 1663: 193
II² 1664: 193
II² 1953: 224
II² 2318: 156, 161, 173
II² 2790: 225
II² 2818: 232
II² 2820: 232, 248
II² 2829: 232, 248
II² 3017: 173
II² 3021: 173
II² 3023: 173
II² 3105: 173
II² 3207: 209
II³ 294: 231, 236
II³ 298: 43, 44, 50, 239
II³ 302: 236
II³ 304: 239
II³ 306: 221, 225, 226
II³ 317: 231, 236
II³ 322: 231
II³ 324: 231
II³ 327: 226
II³ 333: 234, 236
II³ 336: 210
II³ 338: 211, 220, 245, 246
II³ 342: 231
II³ 343: 231
II³ 344: 231
II³ 346: 236
II³ 347: 231
II³ 348: 211, 221, 230, 245, 246
II³ 352: 213, 231
II³ 355: 245
II³ 359: 226
II³ 360: 226
II³ 361: 194
II³ 367: 231
II³ 370: 174, 175
II³ 375: 236
II³ 379: 231
II³ 383: 231
II³ 387: 239
II³ 388: 239
II³ 390: 231
II³ 392: 231
II³ 398: 231, 239
II³ 401: 239
II³ 403: 231
II³ 405: 231
II³ 406: 231
II³ 416: 245
II³ 417: 225
II³ 418: 236
II³ 432: 231, 236
II³ 434: 231
II³ 435: 231, 236
II³ 437: 236
II³ 455: 236
II³ 468: 231
II³ 474: 231
II³ 475: 231
II³ 478: 231
II³ 479: 231
II³ 492: 231, 236
II³ 493: 231, 236
II³ 516: 231
II³ 911: 38
IX, 1², 717: 109
IX, 1², 882: 55, 60, 112

IX, 2, 257: 109
XI, 4, 664: 53
XI, 4, 665: 53
XI, 4, 1053: 53
XII, 4, 1, 75: 21, 23
XII, 4, 1, 94: 24
XII, 5, 129: 38, 39
XII, 5, 608: 120
XII, 7, 221 b: 49
XII, 9, 187 A: 109
XII Suppl. 549: 44, 52, 59, 63, 108, 112

Jeffery 1990
pl. 11 no. 2: 76
pl. 71 no. 50: 76

Lindian Chronicle
FGrH 532: 98

Ma 2002
17: 38, 39, 41, 45
Maier 1959–1961
69: 22
Meiggs–Lewis
82: 109
Meritt 1963
41 no. 42: 232
Michel, *Recueil*
188: 109
Migeotte 1984
102: 24
Migeotte 1992
22: 19, 25
23: 20, 25
25: 22
34: 20, 21, 25, 37
37: 20, 25
38: 20, 25
40: 22
41: 20, 25
43: 20, 25
45: 20, 25
50: 20, 21, 23
52: 20, 25
58: 22
60: 22
66: 22
67: 20, 22, 25
69: 20, 22, 25
73: 20, 25
75: 19, 24, 25
76: 22
78: 20, 25
79: 20, 25
80: 19, 23, 25
81: 20, 25
83: 20, 25
84: 20, 25
Moretti 1953
1: 118
8: 118
11: 119
26: 119
Moretti 1967–1975
99: 21, 37

Nomima
I 8: 44, 59, 63, 108
I 32: 44, 55, 59, 63
I 33: 108, 109
I 34: 55, 60, 112
I 35: 109
I 37: 60, 112
I 38: 60
I 39: 44, 52, 59, 63, 108, 112
I 40: 55, 59, 112

OGIS
10: 38, 49
213: 38
221: 50
222: 47
223: 37, 47
227: 47
229: 56
267 II: 38
339: 38, 39, 115
748: 43
763: 38, 39

Paton and Hicks 1891
10: 21, 23
Pouilloux 1950
111 no. 2: 173

Raubitschek 1949
21: 127
111: 128
120: 127, 137
131b: 167
139: 128
174: 127
RC
10–13: 50
15: 37, 47
22: 47
45: 38
52: 38, 39
Reinmuth 1971

Reinmuth 1971 (cont.)
51–2 no. 13: 173
RO
4: 192
9: 194
11: 194
46: 221
94: 213
100: 174
Robert 1983, 126: 37, 38, 41, 45

Şahin 1976, 20–1: 39
SEG
II 663: 38, 39
X 50: 110
X 54: 110
X 76: 110
X 111: 110
X 120: 110
X 129: 110
X 140: 110
XI 257: 103
XI add. 1180 a: 60, 112
XII 41: 110
XII 52: 232
XIII 239: 109
XVI 10: 110
XIX 204: 197
XXI 57: 110
XXI 230: 237, 244
XXII 116: 213, 249
XXIV 153: 232, 248
XXIV 197: 232, 248
XXVI 476: 60
XXVI 1223: 39
XXVII 929: 49
XXVIII 45: 188, 189, 244
XXVIII 46: 189
XXX 125: 173
XXXI 162: 173
XXXVI 1218: 37, 47, 56
XXXVIII 128: 232
XLI 102: 193
XLII 112: 221
XLVII 111: 39
LII 86: 188, 189
Shear 1978a, 2–4: 38
Syll.[3]
4: 44, 55
106: 109
126: 193, 194
206: 43, 44, 50
317: 37, 38
354: 38
360: 77
374: 38, 39
401: 38
409: 39, 43
493: 38, 39
671 B: 42, 54, 71
1057: 120

TAM II
16: 24
168: 19, 23
Tod
106: 193, 194
107 A: 193

Walbank 1978
9: 110
10: 110
11: 110
12: 110
13: 110
14: 110
16: 110
17: 110
20: 110
21: 110
22: 110
23: 110
26: 110
28: 110
29: 110
35: 110
36: 110
37: 110
39: 110, 138
40: 110
43: 110
44: 110
45: 110
46: 110
48: 110
49: 110
50: 110
51: 110
52: 110
53: 110
54: 110, 111
55: 110
56: 110
58: 110
59: 110
60: 110, 138
62: 110
64: 110
65: 110
67: 110

68: 110
72: 110
73: 110
85: 110
87: 110
88: 110
89: 110
90: 110
91: 110
93: 110, 111
Wörrle 1975, 59–60: 38
Wörrle 1977, 44: 49

General Index

Abdera, 113
Acamantis, 173, 232
Acanthus, 113
Acanthus Column (Delphi), 198
Acharnae, 232
Achilles, 61, 62
acquittal as reward, 218
Adeimantus of Athens, 143
Adrastus, 27
Adriatic, 174
Aeaces of Samos, 96
Aegean, 198
Aegina, 64, 69, 81, 178
Aegospotami, battle of, 187
Aelius Aristides, 166
Aeschines, 39, 71, 169, 176, 188, 197, 205, 208, 222, 226, 227, 238, 242, 255
Aeschylus, 125, 156, 169, 229
Aesepus' sons, benefactors of Cyzicus, 58
Aetolians, 61
Agathon, 173
Agiadas of Elis, 118
agonistic mentality. *See* elite and competion, euergetism and competition
agorai, 67, 68, 102, 115, 116, 121, 124, 125, 126, 130, 142, 192
Ajax, 34
Alcaeus, 74, 91
Alcibiades, 55, 109, 123, 133, 134, 136, 152, 153, 154, 155, 171, 177, 182, 185, 186, 199, 243, 254
Alcibiades 'the Elder', 177
Alcimedon of Aegina, 64
Alcinous, 74
Alcmaeonidae, 75, 76, 84, 165
Alcman, 81
Alea (Arcadia), 109
Alexander I, 52, 59, 108
Alexander the Great, 125, 183, 205, 210, 228
Alexandria, 47
altar, altars, 122
 in the sancturary of Apollo Pythius by the Ilissus, 100
 of Apollo (Athens, agora), 125, 212, 228, 247, 249
 of the god of the Achelous River, 102
 of the Twelve Gods (Athens), 100
 of Zeus Eleutherius (Samos), 101
altruism, 27, 258
 in classical Athens, 16
Alyattes, 113
Alyzia, battle of, 198
Amazons, 61
ambassadors, 42, 47, 50, 86, 152, 159, 210, 212, 234, 236, 237, 240, 244
Amphiareum of Oropus, 211
Amphitres of Miletus, 103
Amyntas, 234
Amyzon, 231
anathêmata, 101, 116, 118
Anaxilas of Naxos, 59
Andocides, 78, 155, 168, 185, 186, 187, 190, 191, 197
Antenor, 137, 162, 163
anthropology, historical anthropology, 11, 12, 36, 88, 103
antidosis, 80, 83, 150
Antigonus Doson, 49
Antigonus Gonatas, 49
Antigonus Monophthalmus, 48
Antiochus I, 46, 47, 49
Antiochus II, 46, 56
Antiochus III, 41
Antiochus of Lepreon, 134
Antiphon, 207
Antissa, 239
Aphrodite, 128, 129, 193, 232
aphthonos, 95
Apollo Zoster, priest of, 232
Apollodorus, trierarch in 362/1, 237, 244
aqueduct from Mount Lycabettus to the agora, 100

Arcesilaus III of Cyrene, 96
Archeneüs, money-lender, 237
Archilochus, 87
Archinus decree, 188, 195
Archinus of Argos, 103
Archinus of Coele, 191
Archippe of Cyme, 43
Archippus of Thasos, 234
architheôriai, 152
archontes, 25, 110, 143
Areopagus, 149
aretê, 59
Argos, 62, 115
Aristagoras of Miletus, 98
aristeia. *See* awards of valor
Aristides, 177
Aristoclidas of Aegina, 64, 70
aristocratic values, 29, 74, 92, 93
Aristodemus of Cyme, 93
Aristodemus, the actor, ambassador to Philipp II, 238
Aristodicides of Assos, 49, 50
Aristogiton. *See* Harmodius and Aristogiton
aristokrateia, 14
Aristonicus of Phrearrii, 205
Aristonicus, son of Nicophanes from Anagyrus, 205
Aristophanes, 133, 181, 182
Aristophon of Athens, 138
Aristopithes, Athenian ambassador to Lesbos, 239
Aristoteles decree, 198
Aristoteles, son of Chelonius, 52, 59, 63, 108
Aristotle, 28, 34, 35, 88, 93, 101, 146, 248
Arrhachion of Phigalia, 67, 90, 126, 137
Artaxerxes I, 27
Artemis Brauronia, sacred precint on the acropolis of, 100
Artemisium, battle of, 171
artisans, 74, 75
Asia Minor, 2, 3, 192, 194
assembly. *See* ecclesia
Astydamas, 125, 229
Astylus of Croton, 115, 120
asylia, 108, 111
asymmetrical exchange, 146, 147
ateleia, 51, 53, 58, 59, 61, 108, 109, 110, 111, 150, 192, 197, 229, 241, 244, 251, *see also* taxes, exemption from
Athena, 67
Athena Lindia, 97
Athena Nike's *temenos* on the acropolis, 100
Athenaeus, 136, 140
Athenian empire, 148, 160, 180, 199, 253, 254
Athens
 acropolis of, 68, 99, 100, 118, 127, 136, 137, 162, 167, 178, 191, 196, 221
 agora of, 100, 125, 130, 142, 162, 168, 170, 191, 193, 195, 196
 and its benefactors, 38
 its resources in the fifth century BC, 41, 144, 145, 148, 149, 252, 254
 its resources in the fourth century BC, 41, 180, 199, 213, 229, 244, 246, 253
athla, 170, 220, *see also* prizes
athletes
 and tyranny, 66, 90, 94, 134, 135
 as benefactors. *See* benefactors, athletes as
 as members of the elite, 66, 88, 106
 criticism of honors for, 66, 84, 88, 135
 honored in archaic poleis, 55, 63, 66, 88, 90, 251
 honored in classical Athens, 131, 161
 Solon's legislation on, 89
 their rewards in Sparta, 69
 worshipped, 121
athletic victories
 as benefactions, 63, 85, 86, 88, 89, 107, 153, 162
 as *dôreai*, 64
Athmonon, 232
Attica, 83, 131
Autolycus, Athenian ambassador to Lesbos, 239
Autolycus, the pancratiast, 128, 130
autonomy as gift, 47, 57
awards of valor, 171, 172, 222, 227, 243, 253

Bacchylides, 64, 91, 94, 95, 120
banquets, 43, 76, 79, 92, 136, 193
basileis, 15, 74, 103, 105
Bellerophon, 33, 35, 61, 62
benefactions, 2, 180
 and memory, 37, 41, 47, 147, 163, 218
 as *dôreai*, 43, 50, 207
 as *euergesiai*, 5, 37, 59, 147, 180
 causes of, 5, 257
 definition of, 7, 36
 notion of, 84, 85, 87, 210, 213, 215, 219, 247, 252, 254, 255, 257
 obligatory, 216
benefactors
 as *euergetai*, 3, 4, 5, 7, 21, 25, 49, 72, 223
 Athenians as, 158, 159
 athletes as, 44, 63, 65, 66, 87, 107, 133, 251
 citizens as, 3, 7, 21, 36, 37, 44, 55, 72, 87, 107, 139, 144, 151, 163, 176, 215, 225, 231
 definition of, 5
 foreigners as, 4, 7, 39, 41, 44, 63, 72, 84, 87, 107, 108, 147, 196
 in *epinikia*, 64

benefactors (cont.)
kings as, 38, 46, 48
of Darius I, 30
beneficence, 9, 10
Berenice II, 47
big men, 88, 103, 104
differences and similarites between tyrants and, 104
differences between chiefs and, 104
their attributes, 104
Bion of Erechtheis, 151
Black Sea, 183, 187
Boeotia, 33, 137
Bolkestein, Hendrik, 9, 10
booty, 62, 75, 84, 97, 103, 148, 171
Bosphorus, 239
Boulanger, André, 1, 2, 3
boule, 38, 110, 149, 214, 220, 225, 230, 233, 238, 243, 245, 253
bouleutêrion, 43
bouleutês. *See* councilors
Bourdieu, Pierre, 12, 13
Brasidas, 184
bribery, 77, 142, 143, 202
Byzantium, 209

Callias of Athens, Olympic winner in 564 BC, 69
Callias of Chalcis, 206
Callias of Elis, 61
Callias, son of Didymias, 118, 127, 136
Callias, son of Hipponicus, 127, 144
Callimachus, Athenian polemarch, 168
Callimachus, poet, 115, 122
Callinus, 87
Cambyses II, 30
Cecropis, 173, 232
census classes, 83, 215
Ceos, 120, 134
Cephisodotus of Thebes, 113
Cephisodotus, Athenian general, 210
Chabrias, 197, 198, 241, 244, 253
Chaeronea, battle of, 199, 205, 210, 246
Chalcis, 137
Chares, 209
Charidemus, Athenian general, 210, 224
Charinus, benefactor of a deme, 232
charis, 78, 201, 216
charites, 38, 39
charity, 9, 10, 103, 140, 189
Cheimon of Argos, 115, 126
Chephisodorus, 210
Chersonesus, Thracian, 134
chiefly dues, 63
Chimera, 61
Chionis of Sparta, 68, 120
chorêgiai, chorêgoi, 37, 71, 80, 81, 143, 151, 152, 154, 155, 161, 172, 173, 200, 202, 203, 204, 209, 232, 233, 248
Cimon, 55, 71, 77, 78, 105, 140, 141, 143, 144, 145, 149, 151, 154, 156, 157, 169, 176, 177, 233, 249
compared to tyrants, 95, 98
Cimon, son of Stesagoras, 135
citizenship. *See politeia*
class struggle, 17, 82, 87, 93
Clazomenae, 119
Cleaenetus of Pandionis, 151
Cleaenetus, father of Cleon, 181
Cleander of Aegina, 69
Cleisthenes, 82, 99, 100, 225
Cleisthenes of Sicyon, 97, 102
Cleobulus of Lindus, 97, 102
Cleomantis of Delphi, 61
Cleombrotus, son of Dexilaus of Sybaris, 67, 90, 132, 137
Cleon, 133, 151, 154, 161, 181, 184, 185, 196, 197, 219, 243
Cleonymus, the Cretan, 205
cleruchies, 156
clients, 77, 88, 146, 223, 233, 252, 257
Cnidus, battle of, 125, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 198
Codrus, 61
collective memory, manipulation of, 163, 164, 194, 195, 196, 198, 199, 244
Colophon, 19, 22, 24
Conon, 125, 126, 129, 133, 138, 166, 192, 193, 195, 198, 241, 253, *see also* statue, statues
Corcyra, 60, 108
Corinth, 72, 105, 108, 210
Peirene and Glauce, fountains in, 101
Corinthian War, 196, 205
Cos, 19, 21, 23
council. *See* boule
councilors, 233, 245, 249, 253
counter-gifts. *See* rewards
Crannon, 19, 20
Crateraeus, 21
Craterus, historian, 209
Cratinus, 140, 151
Cresilas, 167
Crisa, 103
Critius, 127, 137, 162
Critobulus, 202
Croesus, 27, 29, 32, 44, 61, 113
Croton, 61
crowns, 25, 37, 47, 49, 51, 53, 89, 97, 135, 154, 171, 172, 174, 175, 179, 181, 182, 185, 187, 199, 211, 212, 213, 219, 222, 224, 225, 227, 228, 229, 232, 242, 243, 244, 250, 252, 255

gold crowns, 19, 36, 39, 43, 44, 50, 174, 182, 183, 188, 192, 197, 208, 224, 231, 232, 244
olive crowns, 67, 171, 178, 184, 189, 231, 238
Ctesiphon, ambassador to Philip II, 238
Ctesiphon, friend of Demosthenes, 208, 224
Curetes, 61
custom duties
exemption from, 40, 44
Cyaxares, 36
Cylon, 90, 134
Cyme, 43, 54
Cynaegirus, 168, 169
Cyniscus of Mantinea, 118
Cyprus, 108, 193
Cypselids, 101, 105
anathêmata of the, 101
Cypselus of Corinth, 96, 97, 98
Cyrene, 64, 69
Cyrnus, 128
Cyrus II, 29, 32, 35, 36, 41
Cyzicus, 58, 63, 76

Damonides of Oea, 156
Darius I, 30, 34
Dark Age, 73, 103, 105
debts, 20
cancellation of, 93
Decelea, 61
Decelean War, 200
Deinias of Aegina, 70
Deinias, Athenian benefactor in the time of Lycurgus, 212, 247
deipnon, 188, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 244
as reward, 238, 240
differences between *xenia* and, 235
origins of, 236
Delian League, 148, 149, 160, 199, 216, 252
Delos, 152
Delphi, 42, 44, 45, 61, 75, 84, 86, 101, 170
Demades, 125, 131, 228
demarchs, 233
demes, Athenian, 61, 140, 142, 143, 213, 214, 221, 231, 233, 247, 249
and euergetism, 214, 231, 253
benefactors in, 214, 231
demos and elite in, 233
elites of, 248
Demetrius of Phaleron, 229
Demetrius Poliorcetes, 49
Demochares, 207, 209, 213
Demochares decree, 212
democracy as gift, 47, 57
Democrates of Aexone, 233
Democritus, 78
demonstrative expenditure. *See* display by elite
Demophantus decree, 190, 191, 245
demos, 17
and elite, 5, 6, 18, 36, 88, 105, 107, 147, 150, 154, 233, 251
and elite in fifth-century Athens, 18, 144, 146, 147, 155, 156, 223
and elite in fourth-century Athens, 18, 200, 223, 243
and elite in the archaic period, 17, 73, 74, 82, 87, 146
and gifts in fifth-century Athens, 55, 145, 149, 186, 252
and gifts in fourth-century Athens, 180, 205, 208, 223, 254
archaic, 17
as benefactor, 156
in Athens, 50, 160, 176, 191, 217, 223
in Corcyra, 60
in Cos, 21, 23
in Homer, 74
Demosthenes, general in the Peloponnesian War, 181
Demosthenes, orator, 24, 28, 38, 40, 41, 43, 76, 80, 83, 125, 126, 166, 174, 190, 193, 197, 198, 205, 207, 210, 215, 222, 224, 225, 227, 233, 238, 241, 242, 245, 246, 247, 253
as benefactor, 39, 175, 203, 207, 208, 209, 212, 224, 245, 255
Derrida, Jacques, 12
Diagoras of Rhodes, 120, 124
Dicaeogenes, son of Proxenus, 25, 205
Dinarchus, 205, 228
Diochares, son of Diocles of Pithus, 213
Diocleidas, representative of king Antigonus, 49
Diocleides, 168, 188, 244, 253
Diodorus Siculus, 48, 89, 172
Diogenes Laertius, 67, 89, 125
Diognetus of Crete, 121
Diomedes, 35
Dionysia, 79, 151, 155, 175
Dionysius, benefactor of Gortyn, 59, 63, 108
Dionysus, 103
Diotimus, Athenian general, 210, 224
Diphilus, perhaps son of Diopithes, 125, 228
Diphilus, *proxenos* of Alea, 109
donations, 5, 21, 27, 37, 248, *see also* public subscriptions
archaic, 3, 73, 84
as counter-gifts, 13
causes of, 4, 6, 11, 257
given during the exercise of a public office, 207, 210, 212, 219, 226, 246
in Homer, 63
of ships, 206
private, 207, 212, 213, 214, 219, 247, 249

dôra. *See dôreai*
dôreai, 28, 43, 44, 50, 51, 54, 132, 183, 184, 190, 193, 197, 207, 220, 229, 241, 249, 255, 256, *see also* gifts
 athletic victories as, 64
 for athletes, 66, 84
 word, 44
Dorieus of Rhodes, 134
Dorieus, Spartan prince, 61
dôtinai, 62
Dracon, 75
Dyme, 114

ecclesia, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 37, 38, 60, 74, 110, 122, 130, 134, 135, 144, 149, 154, 181, 183, 184, 187, 204, 214, 218, 221, 222, 230, 233, 242
Egypt, 9, 30
Eion, 176, 177, 253
Eirenas of Miletus, 42
eisphorai, 180, 199, 200, 202, 204, 207, 215, 217, 220, 244, 247, 248, 250
Eleusis, 144, 214
Elis, Eleans, 60, 61
elite, 6
 and competition, 6, 15, 74, 80, 82, 92, 95, 96, 98, 106, 150, 165, 175, 258
 and social mobility, 14, 17, 139, 147
 and the demos. *See* demos and elite
 archaic, 3, 5, 14, 15, 16, 17, 54, 72, 73, 74, 82, 105, 141, 143, 149
 as aristocrats, 14, 73, 92, 103
 Athenian, 200, 203, 207, 214
 changes and continuities in the evolution of, 16, 105, 139, 141, 143, 144, 149
 classical, 15, 139
 display by, 80, 82, 84, 87, 95, 96, 97, 106, 135, 136, 150, 151, 155, 173, 204, 216, 217
 Hellenistic, 3
 its contributions to the polis in the archaic period, 74, 75, 76, 79, 84
elitist ideology, 16, 74, 92, 93, 95, 136
 and euergetism, 249
enktêsis, 39, 40, 49, 53, 227, 251
Enneacrunus fountain house (Athens), 100
envoys. *See* ambassadors
epangellô, epangelia, 19, 20, 21, 23, 49, 50
Ephesus, 49, 194, 198
 battle of, 134
Ephialtic reforms of 462 (Athens), 149, 151
Epicerdes of Cyrene, 184
Epicharinus, Athenian athlete, 127, 137
Epicharmus, 27, 28
Epicrates, reformer of the *ephebia*, 125, 228
Epidaurus, 81
epidoseis, *see also* public subscriptions
 different from public subscriptions, 206
 naval, 206
epigraphic habit, 208, 220, 222, 230, 232, 246
epimeleia, 110, 111
epinikia, 64, 66, 76, 90
 and Athens, 65, 136
 and gift-exchange, 71
 as gifts by athletes, 69, 70, 90, 123, 134
 as rewards, 69
 audience of, 64, 69, 70, 72
 commission of, 64, 70, 72, 86
 compared to cash rewards, 90
 compared to *proedria*, 72
 compared to *sitêsis*, 72
 compared to statues, 70, 123, 124, 133
 disappearance of, 123, 124
 in civic festivals, 71
 involvement of the demos in, 65
 re-performance of, 71, 72, 123
Epizelus, 169
Erechtheis, 232
Eresus, 239
Eretria, 52, 59, 108, 109, 134
Erythrae, 46, 119, 194
Eualcides of Eretria, 134
Euboea, 177, 178, 206, 207, 209, 210
Eubulus, 125, 220, 229
Eucles, Athenian metic, 189
Euctemon, son of Aesion, 207
Eudemus of Plataia, 213, 231
euergesiai, 27, 45
 word, 5
euergetês, euergetai, 3, 45, 52, 53, 59, 77, 85, 95, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 114, 198, 223, 227, 231, 251, *see also* benefactors
 differences between *proxenia, proxenoi* and, 111
 in the archaic polis, 55
 title, 49, 52, 109, 111, 231, 251
 word, 1, 5
euergetism
 and competition, 7, 15, 38, 41, 45, 49, 75, 161, 165, 170, 172, 174, 220, 224, 225, 227, 253
 and democracy, 224
 and gift-exchange, 256, 257
 and prizes, 15
 and reciprocity, 3, 4, 5, 26, 27, 41, 42, 45, 243, 258
 and symbolic capital, 6, 7, 40, 204, 223, 247, 249
 and *xenia* (ritualized friendship), 251
 as exchange of *dôreai*, 43
 as gift-exchange, 3, 4, 12, 14, 26, 32, 36, 43, 44, 45, 54, 251

as institution, 3, 5, 12, 26, 57, 58, 224, 243, 251, 254
as munificence, 4, 5, 10
decentralization of, 214, 253
definition of, 1, 2, 3, 4, 10, 11, 37
democratization of, 234, 243, 245, 253
geographical and chronological range of, 3, 5, 258
Greek perceptions of, 61, 220
Hellenistic, 16, 58, 205, 224, 248, 249, 255
hortatory dimension of, 222, 225
imbalance in, 41, 43
in the archaic period, 44, 58, 73, 251
in the fifth century BC, 44
in the sixth century BC, 61
origins of, 6, 7, 58, 86, 106, 112, 161, 224, 234, 240, 243, 250, 251
paradoxes of, 257, 258
periodization of, 6
regulations in, 133, 222, 223, 226, 228, 245
role in society of, 5, 16
role of proleptic honors in, 46
strategies in, 47, 50, 56, 111, 204, 219, 220, 223, 255, 256, *see also* proleptic honors
word, 3, 4, 9, 10
Eugeiton of Phalerum, 232
Eumenes II, 38, 42, 43, 71
eunoia, 56, 189
Eupalinus tunnel (Samos), 101
Euphemus of Athens, 159
Euripides, 88, 89, 123, 125, 135, 136, 229
Eurybiades of Sparta, 172
Euryptolemus, cousin of Alcibiades, 185
Eutelidas of Sparta, 68, 119
Euthippus, benefactor of Teithras, 232
Euthycles of Locri, 115, 121, 122
Euthymus of Locri, 114, 117, 119, 120, 121, 122
euthyna, 222, 226
Evagoras I, king of Salamis, 138, 192, 193, 194, 195
Exaenetus of Acragas, 121

festivals, 2, 6, 42, 61, 72, 73, 79, 88, 92, 103, 124, 135, 152, 157, 162, 173, 208, 226, 229, 233, 246
and liturgies, 80
civic, 71
financing of, 42
in Aegina, 81
in Athens, 77
in Delphi, 42, 71
in Miletus, 42
in the archaic period, 76, 77, 82, 88
of Amphiaraus, 211
of Apollo (Delos), 152
of the Ionian League, 47
promoted by tyrants, 80, 102, 103
financial system, 204, 215, 219, 220, 226, 253
and gift-exchange, 226
Finley, Moses, 12, 15
First Sacred War, 97
fiscal system
archaic, 73
in Athens, 148
food, 2, 6, 42, 44, 50, 66, 77, 88, 210, 235
funerary monuments, 59, 60, 74

Gadatas, 29, 32
Gate of Diochares, 213
Gauthier, Philippe, 2, 3, 6, 11, 49, 51, 108, 215, 231
Gelon of Gela and Syracuse, 102
generosity, 13, 27, 29, 31, 32, 33, 35, 40, 48, 56, 63, 76, 91, 95, 97, 98, 104, 105, 106, 141, 142, 145, 155, 174, 175, 178, 212, 213, 218, 224, 254, 256, 257
geras (gift of honor), 62
gift-exchange, 12
alternating disequilibrium in, 36
among elite members, 17, 92
and time, 12, 13, 32, 34, 39, 40
chains of gifts and counter-gifts in, 36, 42, 43, 46, 54, 163, 251
contradictions of, 145
costs and benefits in, 34, 40, 151, 205, 215, 217, 252, 257
disjunction in, 13, 32, 33, 35, 40, 182, 216
equilibrium in, 197
equivalence in, 13, 27, 33, 34, 39, 40, 41, 54, 62, 182, 196
imbalance in, 13, 27, 35, 36, 39, 41, 54, 88, 104, 182, 215
in Hesiod, 28, 30, 33
in Homer, 15, 28, 29, 32, 33, 34, 35, 44, 61, 62
institutional/formal, 14, 48, 54, 56, 57, 86, 223
non-institutional/informal, 14, 40, 48, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 72, 84, 86, 107, 139, 155, 161, 170, 218, 223
relationship in, 35, 43, 53, 257
rules of, 8, 12, 42, 46, 47, 49, 54, 252, 253, 256
status in, 147, 149, 255
vocabulary of, 43
gifts
and alienation, 145
and authority, 4
and coercion, 63, 104, 105, 150
and common miscognition, 13, 14, 47
and dependence, 29, 30, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 55, 88, 107, 145, 146, 147, 150, 159, 180, 200, 219, 244, 252, 255
and *hybris*, 6
and interest, 12, 13, 27, 28, 32, 35, 38, 42, 43, 48, 90, 104, 204, 218, 257

gifts (cont.)
and memory, 248
and power, 4, 5, 6, 7, 13, 18, 36, 40, 48, 55, 63, 88, 94, 104, 106, 107, 134, 150, 154, 155, 185, 218, 223, 248, 254, 255, 256
and prestige, 5, 14, 84, 92, 204, 218
and reciprocity, 4, 9, 12, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 35, 36, 37, 58, 104, 145, 216, 219, 243
and social status, 14, 164, 216, 227, 230, 252
and solidarity, 6, 17, 29, 112
as extractions, 62
causes of, 4, 29, 38
definition of, 27, 36
presented as counter-gifts, 45
symbolic value of, 34, 40, 63
to individuals as benefactions for the community, 77, 139, 140, 141
Glaucon, son of Ariston, 204
Glaucus, 35, 62
Godelier, Maurice, 12, 47, 104, 145
Gorgias, 140, 154
Gorgon of Rhodes, 120
Gorgus of Sparta, 60
Gortyn, 59, 108
grain supply, 50, 186, 187, 192, 253
great honors. *See megistai timai*
gymnasia, 42, 115, 116, 126, 212
gymnasiarchiai, 81, 151, 153, 154, 173, 202

Halae Aexonides, 232
Halae Araphenides, 232
Halasarna, 24
Halicarnassus, 39
Hands, Arthur R., 9, 10, 25
Hanisa, 231
H-architecture, 100
Harmodius and Aristogiton, 86, 132, 133, 137, 150, 161, 163, 164, 177, 188, 190, 192, 193, 196, 244, 252
Harmodius, descendant of the Tyrannicide, 197
Harpocration, 228
Hecamede, 62
Hecatombaea, agon of the, 103
Hecatompedon, 178
Hector, 34
Hegelochus of Tarentum, 109
Hellespont, 174, 183, 209, 224
Hénaff, Marcel, 12
Hephaestea, 173
Heraeum of Argos, 102
Heraeum of Samos, 101, 116
Hermolycus, the pancratiast, probably Hermolycus son of Euthoenus, 128
herms, 168, 176, 183, 186, 188
Herodotus of Clazomenae, 119
Herodotus, historian, 27, 29, 30, 32, 34, 59, 61, 81, 84, 93, 96, 99, 101, 103, 109, 113, 128, 134, 159, 163, 171, 172, 177
Hesiod, 28, 30, 35
hestiasis, 79
Hetoemocles of Sparta, 68, 115, 126
Hieron of Syracuse, 94, 95, 115
hierothytai in Lindus, 25
Hipparchus, son of Charmus, 128
Hipparchus, tyrant, 162, 163, 165
Hippias, 80, 98, 161
Hippothontis, 232
Hippucome, 19, 23, 24, 25, 45
Histiaea, 38
Histiaeus of Miletus, 98
Homer, 15, 28, 32, 33, 35, 44, 62, 63, 74, 103, 105, *see also* gift-exchange in Homer
homonoia, 25
honorific inscriptions, 3, 5, 6, 9, 37, 38, 40
archaic, 58, 63
as monuments, 230
as rewards, 208, 222, 230, 251
exhortative function of, 221
in classical Athens, 109, 110
in fourth-century Athens, 208
in public subscriptions, 19, 20, 22, 24, 25
in the early fifth century BC., 59
in the sixth century BC, 60
the demos in, 224
honors, 175
and prizes, 87, 119
as a constituent part of euergetism, 3
as *dôreai*, 43, 44, 50, 125, 132, 190, 197, 198, 222, 255
as gifts (not counter-gifts), 46, 48, 71, 255
collective, 177
controversy surrounding, 71, 84, 137, 169, 176, 180, 182, 183, 185, 188, 191, 197, 198, 220, 228, 229, 240, 241, 242, 253
democratizaation of, 180
for Athenian officials, 226, 245, 253
for councilors, 225
negotiation of, 49, 176, 197
provisional, 226
reduplication of, 119, 252
hortatory clauses, 220
Humphreys, Sally, 12
hybris, 88, 134, 217
Hyperides, 206, 211, 226, 229
hypodechomai, 22, *see also epangellô, epangelia*

Ibycus, 69, 74
Icarion, 232
Idalion, 108
Ilium, 49, 50

Ionian League, 38, 47
Iphicrates, 196, 197, 198, 244, 253
Iphitus, 33
Isaeus, 25, 205
Isocrates, 76, 78, 144, 153, 159, 171, 187, 194, 195, 196, 202, 216, 224, 244
isonomia, 146, 162, 164
isoteleia, 189
Isthmian games, 63, 89, 120, 127, 132
Isthmus, 101
 diolkos of, 101
Istrus, 231
Italy, 212
Ithaca, 28
Iulis, 120

jury pay, 140

katachrêmatizô, 21
kings, 5, 6, 29, 33, 92, 251
 as benefactors. *See* benefactors, kings as
 Hellenistic, 2, 41, 47, 48, 106, 256, 257
 Persian, 34, 109
kômoi, 90
kouroi, 67

Lacedaemonia, Lacedaemonians, 29, 32, *see also* Sparta, Spartans
Laciadae, 140
Laconia, 29, 194
Ladas of Argos, 115
Laertes, 28, 30, 32
lampadêphoroi, 173
Lampsacus, 76
land, 74, 144, 160, 177, 213, 247
 as reward, 61, 108
 donation of, 50
 redistribution of, 93
laos, 62, 79
largesse, politics of, 155, 156, 160, 161, 185
Laura of Samos, 101
law courts, 140, 143, 149, 156, 254
leadership, 218, 242
 as benefaction, 63, 85, 86, 171, 176, 214, 242
Lechaeum, 205
 harbor at, 101
Lemnos, 211
Leochares, 129
Leodamas, son of Erasistratus of Acharnae, 198
Leon of Sparta, 134
Leontis, 232
Leptines, 229, 241
Lesbos, 239
Leucas, 108
Leucon, king of Bosphorus, 43, 50, 51
Leuctra, battle of, 239
Levinas, Emmanuel, 12
Lichas of Sparta, 134
Limyra, 49
Lindus, 19, 25, 124
Lissa, 231
liturgical class, 150, 160, 201, 202, 203, 217, 219
liturgies, 17, 36, 79, 108
 and democratic ideology, 249, 252
 and euergetism, 207
 and honors, 187
 and public discourse, 250, 252, 254
 and symbolic capital, 216, 247
 as benefactions, 36
 avoidance of, 83, 150, 200, 201, 202, 203, 254
 controversy surrounding, 201
 exemption from, 44, 162, 192, 229, 241
 in classical Athens, 7, 16, 139
 in fifth-century Athens, 55, 140, 142, 143, 144, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 161, 216
 in fourth-century Athens, 180, 199, 200, 202, 207, 215, 217, 219, 244, 246, 247, 248
 in the archaic period, 79, 80, 81, 216, 217, 252
 obligatory, 79, 82, 150, 203
 opposition to, 200, 201, 202, 215, 217, 219, 253, 254
 origins of, 79, 149, 182, 217
 prizes in, 172, 173, 174, 220, 227, 253
 symbolism of, 200, 246, 252
 under tyrants, 98
 voluntary, 79, 81, 149, 151, 202, 203, 206, 207, 219, 247
 word, 79
loans, 93, 103, 142, 160, 201, 213
Locri Epizephyrii, 115, 122
Locris, 60, 210
Long Walls (Athens), 142, 193, 194
luxury, 74, 87, 95, 134, 155
 laws against, 96
Lyceum, 213
Lycia, 19, 49, 61, 62
Lycomedes, son of Aeschraeus, 171
Lycophron, Athenian cavalry commander, 211
Lycurgus, 16, 37, 61, 124, 125, 128, 131, 178, 180, 190, 209, 212, 213, 228, 246, 249
Lydia, 29, 61
Lygdamis of Naxos, 92, 96, 97, 102
Lysander, 187
Lysias, 39, 77, 78, 113, 183, 202, 207, 218
Lysimachus, son of Aristides, 41, 177
Lysippus, 119

Macedonia, 212
Maeandrus of Samos, 101
Magnesia by Sipylus, 56

Magnesia on the Maeander, 167
Manes, son of Medices, 58, 63
Marathon, battle of, 166, 168, 175, 229, 241, 253
Marrou, Henri-Irénée, 1, 2, 3
Marxism, 1, 11
Mauss, Marcel, 9, 12, 27
Megacles, Alcmaeonid winner in the Pythian games, 65, 136
Megalopolis, 20
megaloprepeia, 69, 94, 156
Megara, 134, 210
megistai timai, 133, 182, 192, 196, 198, 227, 228, 242
Meidias, 218
Meleager, governor of Antiochus I, 49
Meleager, son of Oeneus, 61
Melissus of Thebes, 64
Melite, 143, 167, 213, 249
Memphis, 30
Menecrates of Oianthea, 60
Menelaus, 30, 62
Menon of Potamus, 238
merismos, 219, 222, 253
Messenia, 19
Metapontum, 59
Methone, 209
Methymna, 239
metics, 184, 188, 199
Metiochus of Athens, 143
Micon, 119, 127, 128
middling ideology, 16
Migeotte, Léopold, 11, 19, 20, 21, 23, 25
Miletus, 42, 45, 47, 113, 125
military commanders, 137, 155, *see also stratêgoi*
 compared to athletes, 199
 honors for, 55, 71, 125, 181, 182, 185, 192, 219, 228, 241, 242, 243, 252
Miltiades, 41, 71, 165, 166, 168, 169, 170, 241
Miltiades the Elder, 134
mines, 157, 199, 213
Minoa in Amorgos, 49
misthos, 156, 157
modernism, 8
Molossia, 212
money, 21, 143, 147, 154, 158, 161, 175, 215, 216, 217, 219, 254, *see also* public subscriptions
 as counter-gift, 139
 as reward, 41, 66, 67, 89, 90, 132, 136, 171, 177, 189
 collected in public subscriptions, 23, 205
 distribution of, 2, 220, 237
 for benefactions, 78, 143, 151, 152, 154, 157, 160, 203, 207, 210, 215
 for construction projects, 169, 193, 211, 245
 for *epinikia*, 70
 for liturgies, 174, 175, 201, 203
 for public offices, 6, 210, 248
 for the poor, 77
 in classical Athens, 83
 pledge of, 19, 21, 22, 24, 25, 46
 public, 145, 148, 156, 157, 159, 186, 200, 214, 248, 254
munificence, 1, 3, 4, 11, 61, 95, 96, 97, 99, 103, 105, 106, 152, *see also* euergetism
Mycale, battle of, 128, 167
Myrrhinous, 232
Myrsilus of Mytilene, 96
Mytilene, 239

naukrariai, 81, 83
Nausicles, Athenian general, 210, 224
Naxos, 97
 battle of, 197, 198
Nemean games, 63, 120, 127, 132
Neoptolemus, son of Anticles, 125, 210, 212, 213, 224, 228, 233, 245, 246, 247, 249
Nepos, 140, 183
Nesiotes, 127, 137, 162
Nestor, 62
Nicagoras, representative of Demetrius Poliorcetes and Seleucus, 49
Niceratus, son of Nicias, 207
Nicias, 55, 151, 152, 153, 154, 161, 199
Nicias, son of Nicodemus, 152
notables, 7, 10, 254

obligatory contributions to the polis, 36, 149, 180, 199, 200, 215, *see also* liturgies
Odeum (Athens), 144, 178
Odysseus, 28, 32, 33, 74
Oebotas of Dyme, 114, 119, 122
Oeneus, 33, 35
oikonomoi, 49
oikos, 66, 72, 74, 78, 86, 88, 139, 142
Old Oligarch, 150, 160, 201, 216
oligarchies, 64, 107, 146, 188, 189, 191, 200, 245
 archaic, 74
oligarchy of 404/3. *See* Thirty Tyrants
oligarchy of the 400, 189, 200, 245
Olympia, 60, 68, 127, 137, 153, 162
Olympic games, 63, 89, 127, 132, 153
Olympieium, 93, 99, 100
Olymus, 19, 24
Olynthus, 206, 209
Onasilus, benefactor of Idalion, 108
Orsippus of Megara, 134
Orthagoras of Sicyon, 97
Orthagorids, 105
ostracism, 149, 155, 156, 163, 167

Paerisades, king of Bosphorus, 44, 50, 51
Panathenaea, 50, 79, 102, 127, 129, 162
Panathenaic stadium, 212, 247
Pandionis, 232
Pantagnotus of Samos, 96
Paralus, son of Pericles, 145
Parthenon, 100, 144, 148
Pasion, banker, 207
Patroclus, 62
patronage, 2, 72, 146, 151, 157, 180, 257, *see also* euergetism
Pausanias the Periegete, 67, 68, 97, 114, 117, 121, 122, 126, 127, 165, 167, 168, 170, 195, 196
Pausanias, king of Sparta, 190
peasants, 33, 74, 93, 103, 142
Pellene, 126
Peloponnesian War, 55, 107, 132, 133, 138, 150, 153, 156, 161, 180, 181, 185, 187, 192, 199, 200, 201, 207, 243, 244, 245, 246, 252, 254
Periander of Corinth, 92, 96, 97, 101
Pericles, 31, 55, 132, 140, 144, 145, 151, 154, 156, 157, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 167, 168, 178, 184, 208, 214
perioikoi, 60
Persia, Persians, 134, 159, 162, 176, 192, 194, 195, 196
Persian Wars, 108, 115, 131, 137, 159, 171, 175, 176, 254
Phaedrus of Sphettus, 39, 43
Phaleas of Chalcedon, 78
Phanodemus of Thymaetadae, 211, 221, 225, 230, 245
Pharnabazus, 193, 194, 196
Phayllus of Acherdus, 190
Pheidon of Argos, 102
Phidippus, son of Apemon, 233
Phigalia, 67, 90
philanthrôpia, 77
philanthropy, 9, 10
Philinus, orator, 229
Philip II, 209, 210, 238
Philochorus, 76
Philocles, son of Eucles, 189
Philocrates, trierarch (associate of Ergocles), 207
philotimia, 25, 40, 56, 175, 211, 212, 220, 221, 222, 225, 245
 semantic change of the word, 221
Philoxenides of Aexone, 233
Phlya, 143
Phocion, 209
Phocylides, 87
Phormio, orator, 190
phratriai, 231, 232, 247
Phrynichus, oligarch, 184, 188
Phrynichus, tragic poet, 143, 172
phylai, 173, 204, 231, 232, 247
phylarchiai, 80
Phyle, 188, 191
Phyteas of Aegina, 69
Pindar, 64, 66, 70, 71, 74, 86, 87, 88, 91, 94, 95, 120, 123, 124, 155
piracy, 97
Piraeus, 44, 183, 187, 189, 190, 192, 209
Pisianax of Athens, 143
Pisistratidae, 82, 92, 97, 98, 99, 100, 102, 105, 113
Pisistratus, 92, 93, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 135, 140, 141, 142, 161, 164
Plato, 85, 88, 98, 135, 152, 171, 177
pledge. *See epangellô, epangelia*
Pliny the Elder, 115, 167
Plutarch, 55, 67, 74, 77, 89, 90, 108, 125, 132, 140, 143, 144, 145, 151, 152, 154, 156, 157, 158, 160, 166, 169, 171, 176, 183
Plutarch of Eretria, 206
Pnyx, 212
polemarchos, 110
politeia (citizenship), 40, 41, 44, 49, 51, 61, 189, 194, 196, 227, 236
Polycrates of Samos, 81, 96, 97, 98, 99, 101
 his role as builder, 101
Polydamas of Pharsalos, 109
Polydamas of Scotussa, 119, 121, 122
Polyeuctus, 125, 228
Pompeium, 125, 229
poor, the, 6, 9, 10, 78, 103, 140, 142, 144, 157, 161, 217, 243, 258
positivism, 1, 9, 10, 11
postmodernism, 1, 7, 8, 15
Potidaea, battle of, 148, 171
Praxidamas of Aegina, 68
prizes, 129, 130, 170, 171, 173, 174, 220, 224, 225
 and liturgies, 161
 for councilors, 225
processions, 152, 172
 as rewards, 69, 120
Procles of Epidaurus, 92
proedria, 40, 61, 86, 109, 137, 162, 164, 181, 182, 185, 192, 196, 197, 220, 227, 228, 231, 243, 253
 for athletes, 66, 69, 71, 84, 119, 123, 132, 136
proedroi, 226, 239
proeisphorai, 201
Proetus, 62
proleptic honors, 45, 49, 111, 197, 256
 definition of, 45
 logic of, 53
 origins of, 56
 scope and chronological range of, 46, 48
Promachus of Pellene, 115, 119, 130
promanteia, 61
Promethea, 173

promise. *See epangellô, epangelia*
Pronapes, son of Pronapides, 127
Propylaea, 144, 178
proxenia, proxenoi, 39, 49, 59, 109, 222, 227, 231, 251
and *euergesia*, 52, 109, 111, 231
and gift-exchange, 44, 113
and status as benefactor, 46
and the origins of euergetism, 112, 113, 240, 251
and *xenia* (hospitality meal), 236, 237, 240
and *xenia* (ritualized friendship), 52, 112
as proleptic honor, 51, 53
as reward, 52
definition of, 51
differences between *euergesia, euergetai* and, 111
evolution of, 51, 52, 109
origins of, 113
privileges of, 111
title, 60, 109, 111
prytaneion, 58, 110, 116, 128, 130, 131, 133, 162, 165, 166, 177, 179, 188, 196, 220, 228, 234, 236, 238, 239, 240, 242, 251
prytaneion decree, 131, 132, 133, 137, 150, 162, 181, 237
prytaneis, 110, 190, 225, 232, 245
Ps.-Aristotle, *Athenaion Politeia*, 76, 98, 102, 128, 140, 141, 142, 154, 156, 157, 160, 189
Ps.-Aristotle, *Oeconomica*, 80, 83
Ps.-Plutarch, *Lives of the Ten Orators*, 209, 213
Ps.-Xenophon, *Athenaion Politeia*, 80, 82
Psaumis of Camarina, 64
Ptolemy I, 37, 48
Ptolemy II, 37
Ptolemy III, 37, 47
public buildings, 2, 6, 22, 37, 45, 71, 76, 120, 212, 248
and Lycurgus' building program, 212, 214
and Pericles' building program, 55, 144, 148, 158, 212
archaic, 75, 88
in fifth-century Athens, 139, 142, 143, 145, 148, 151, 169
in fourth-century Athens, 209, 211, 213, 246
public baths, 19
public discourse, 12, 18, 39, 47, 48, 56, 87, 104, 250, 252, 254, 255, 256, 257
on liturgies, 217, 247
public praise, 19, 20, 21, 25, 43, 110, 172, 225, 227, 229, 231, 239, 244, 250
public subscriptions, 14, 19, 20, 200, 204, 207, 248, 249, 254, *see also epidoseis*
and democratic ideology, 205, 246, 254
contributions in kind in, 23
defaulters in, 21, 24, 25, 26, 46
didômi in, 22
pledges in, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 45, 204, 205
proleptic honors in, 46
syneispherô in, 22
Pydna, 209
Pylos, 133
Pyrrha, 239
Pythagoras of Ephesus, 97, 102
Pythagoras of Samos, 117
Pytheas of Alopece, 211, 212, 220, 245
Pythian games, 63, 127, 132

Quass, Friedemann, 6, 11, 254

ransom, 77, 212
reciprocity, 12, 258
and social status, 12, 13
balanced/direct, 12, 252
generalized/indirect, 12, 36, 247, 252
negative, 216
rewards
and prizes, 170, 172, 174, 175, 224, 225, 253
as *dôreai*, 44, 59, 183
collective, 176
equivalence in, 41
excessive, 40, 41, 43, 45, 147, 169
in Sparta, 85
request for, 27, 38, 63, 181, 197, 198, 219, 226, 243, 245
value of, 40, 41
Rhenea, 152
Rhexibius of Opus, 68
Rhinon of Paeania, 189, 190
Rhodes, Rhodians, 38, 48, 120, 134
rich, the, 6, 9, 24, 79, 81, 83, 84, 97, 98, 135, 144, 150, 151, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 205, 209, 212, 214, 215, 216, 217, 228, 233, 242, 247, 248, 252, 253, 254
in fourth-century Athens, 55

sacrifices, 75, 76, 94, 160, 189, 193, 226, 235, 248
in honor of Ptolemy III and Berenice II, 47
Sahlins, Marshall, 12, 104
Salamis (Cyprus), 195
Salamis, battle of, 166, 171, 175, 241, 253
Samos, 33, 76, 81, 97, 155, 178, 183, 186, 187, 194, 198
harbor mole at, 101
Polycrates' building works at, 101
sanctuary, sanctuaries
at Athens, 191
at Corinth, 97
at Delphi, 42, 122
at Ilium, 50
of Ammon, 211
of Amphiaraus in Oropus, 211, 212, 230

of Apollo Pythius by the Ilissus, 100
of Artemis at Brauron, 100
of Asclepius (Athens), 212
of Demeter (Eleusis), 212
of Demeter and Core at Acrocorinth, 101
of Dionysus Eleuthereus (Athens), 100, 152
of Hera (Samos), 101
of Meter (Colophon), 22
of the gods Loandeis (Hippucome), 19
Sardis, 29, 33
Sarpedon, 62
Sartre, Maurice, 11
Satyrus, king of Bosphorus, 44, 50, 51
schools, 2, 121
Scione, 184
sculptors, 75, 119, 123, 127, 128, 129, 137, 162, 167
Second Athenian Confederacy, 198, 199
Seleucia in Pieria, 38
Seleucus I, 49
Seleucus II, 47, 56
shame culture, 25, 26
Sicily, 94, 134, 152, 153, 154, 174, 185, 212, 254
Sicyon, 102, 105
Simena, 20
Simonides, 69, 74, 134, 143, 162
sitêsis, 58, 86, 109, 131, 137, 162, 164, 181, 185, 192, 196, 197, 227, 228, 234, 242, 243, 251, 253
for athletes, 66, 69, 71, 84, 119, 123, 129, 132, 136
for military commanders, 179
slaves, 146
Smyrna, 22, 56
social conflicts, 78, 200
social distance, 74, 80, 92, 106, 150, 204
social status, 14
and obligation, 76, 84
and reciprocity, 12, 13, 104
social tensions, 87, 88, 93
Social War, 16, 180, 199, 220, 221, 245, 246, 253
sociology, historical sociology, 1, 8, 10, 11
Socrates, 32, 85, 125, 171, 202, 204, 229
solidarity, 88, 92
Solon, 75, 76, 77, 80, 83, 87, 89, 90, 96, 100, 133, 146, 190
and athletes, 67, 89, 133
Solymi, 61
Sophanes of Decelea, 169
Sophocles, 125, 151, 229
sôphrosyne, 59
Sostratus of Pellene, 114
Sparta, Spartans, 60, 61, 68, 69, 85, 109, 113, 120, 159, 163, 165, 171, 187, 192, 193, 196, 197, 198, *see also* Lacedaemonia, Lacedaemonians
Spartocus, king of Bosphorus, 44, 50, 51
Sphacteria, battle of, 181, 196
springhouse decree (Athens), 55, 145, 156
statue, statues, 53
and disjunctive representation, 116
and inscriptions, 116, 117, 119, 129
and self-representation, 67, 116, 117, 118, 129, 165, 166, 167, 170
as honors, 37, 40, 114, 115, 118, 166
at Teithras, 232
between honorific and votive, 129, 130
commission of, 115, 170
dedicated by Callias, son of Hipponicus, 127
dedicated by Leagrus to the Twelve Gods, 130
dedicated by Timotheus, son of Conon, 128
earliest for athletes, 68
earliest in Olympia, 68
for foreginers, 194
in Athens, 124, 125, 126, 129, 133, 137, 138, 163, 166, 228, 241
in *epinikia*, 123, 124
in Miletus, 125
in temples and sanctuaries, 116, 130
in the agora, 67, 68, 90, 115, 116, 121, 124, 125, 126, 131, 136, 192, 196, 197, 198, 228
in the prytaneion, 130
location of, 116, 125
of Aeschylus, 125, 229
of Agiadas of Elis, 118
of Aphrodite (Halae Aexonides), 232
of Apollo (Thornax), 29
of Archippe of Cyme, 43
of Aristoclidas of Aegina, 126
of Aristophon of Athens, 138
of Arrhachion of Phigalia, 67, 90, 126, 137
of Astydamas, 125, 229
of Astylus of Croton, 115
of athletes, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 90, 91, 114, 118, 119, 120, 124, 126, 127
of Autolycus the pancratiast, 128, 130
of Callias, son of Didymias, 118, 127
of Callias, son of Hipponicus, 128
of Chabrias, 197, 198, 244, 253
of Cheimon of Argos, 115, 126
of Chionis of Sparta, 68, 119, 120
of citizens, 196
of Cleombrotus of Sybaris, 67, 68, 90, 132, 137
of Conon, 125, 133, 166, 194, 196, 197, 210, 244, 253
of Cylon of Athens, 68, 115
of Cyniscus of Mantinea, 118
of Demades, 125, 131, 228
of Demosthenes, 210
of Diphilus, perhaps son of Diopithes, 125, 228
of Epicharinus (by Critius), 127, 137
of Epicrates, 125, 228
of Epitherses of Erythrae, 119
of Euripides, 125, 229

statue, statues (cont.)
of Eutelidas of Sparta, 68, 119
of Euthycles of Locri, 115, 122, 126
of Euthymus of Locri, 114, 117, 119, 122, 126
of Evagoras I, king of Salamis, 138, 193, 194, 196
of foreigners, 138, 196
of Harmodius and Aristogiton, 125, 126, 131, 137, 162, 163, 166, 170, 191, 193
of Hermolycus, the pancratiast, probably Hermolycus son of Euthoenus, 128
of Herodotus of Clazomenae, 119
of Hetoemocles of Sparta, 68, 115, 126
of Hipparchus, son of Charmus, 137
of Iphicrates, 196, 244, 253
of Ladas of Argos, 115
of military commanders, 125, 126, 129, 131, 137, 168, 192, 196, 198, 219, 241, 244
of Miltiades, 126, 165, 166, 169, 170
of Neoptolemus, son of Anticles, 125, 249
of Oebotas of Dyme, 114, 122
of Pericles, 167, 168
of Polydamas of Scotussa, 119, 122
of Praxidamas of Aegina, 68
of Promachus of Pellene, 115, 119, 126, 130
of Pronapes, son of Pronapides, 127
of Ptolemy III and Berenice II, 47
of Rhexibius of Opus, 68
of Socrates, 125, 229
of Sophocles, 125, 229
of Tellon, son of Daemon, 118
of the Eponymous Heroes (Athens), 25
of the Geneleus group (Samos), 116
of Theagenes of Thasos, 114, 122, 126
of Themistocles, 126, 165, 166, 169
of Timotheus, 197, 198, 244, 253
of unknown person by Micon, 128
of Xanthippus, father of Pericles, 167
of Zeus at Olympia, 101
on Naxos under Lygdamis, 97
votive, 116, 117, 118, 122, 129, 166, 196
wooden, 68
Stesichorus, 74
Stoa of the Herms (Athens), 142, 176
Stoa of Zeus (Athens), 192
Stoa Pisianacteios, 143
Stoa Poikile, 71, 143, 168, 169, 177, 229, 253
stratêgoi, 110, 133, 167, 185, *see also* military commanders
stratiôtika, 220, 222, 253
Stratocles decree, 214
Stratonice, wife of Seleucus I then Antiochus I, 56
structuralism, 1, 4, 11
subordination, 254, 257
as counter-gift, 88, 94, 106, 147, 223, 252
Susa, 30
Sybaris, 61, 66, 67, 90
Syloson of Samos, 30, 34, 96
symmoriai, 201, 204, 220, 222, 247, 248, 250, 253
symposia, 74, 124
syntrierarchos, 228
Syracuse, 17, 27, 159

taxes, 6, 44, 73, 98, 148
archaic, 75
exemption from, 49, *see also ateleia*
in Pisitratid Athens, 82
Tegea, 172
Teithras, 232
Telesicrates of Cyrene, 64, 69
Telesterion (Eleusis), 144
Tellon, son of Daemon, 118
Telys of Sybaris, 96, 97
temple, temples, 94, 99
archaic, 75, 76
at Sagri on Naxos, 102
atributed to Pythagoras of Ephesus, 102
expenses for their construction, 75
in Corinth, 99
in fifth-century Athens, 144
in Himera, 102
in Syracuse, 102
next to Mount Etna, 102
of Aphrodite Euploia, 193
of Apollo at Corinth, 101
of Apollo at Delphi, 75, 76, 84, 86
of Apollo at Palati, 102
of Apollo Lycius, 115
of Apollo Patroüs, 212
of Artemis Aristoboule, 143, 166, 213, 233, 249
of Artemis in the sanctuary at Brauron, 100
of Athena Lindia, 102, 120, 124
of Hera on Samos, 101
of Heros Melanippus at Sicyon, 102
of Lacinian Hera, 115
of Peace in Rome, 115
of Poseidon at the Isthmus, 101
of Rhoecus on Samos, 76
of the Lycomidae, 143
of Zeus Olympius at Corinth, 101
Tenedus, 62
Teos, 41, 42, 45
Termessus, 20, 25
Thargelia, 174
Thasos, 121, 126, 148
Theagenes of Megara, 102
Theagenes of Thasos, 114, 121
theater of Dionysus, 125, 166, 168, 212, 229
Thebes, 64, 113, 205, 210, 228, 239
themistes, 62

Themistocles, 27, 41, 108, 143, 165, 166, 169, 171, 172, 241
Theognis, 91
Theophrastus, 140
Theopompus, 139, 140, 154
theôrikon, 208, 220, 229, 242, 255
Theozotides decree, 189, 191, 195
Theron of Acragas, 95
Theseum, 142
Thesprotia, 212
Thessalus, son of Pisistratus, 165
Thessaly, 20, 76, 212, 239
thêtes, 146
Thetonium, 108
Thirty Tyrants, 188, 189, 190, 192, 200, 244, 245
Thornax, 29
Thrace, 33
Thrasybulus of Calydon, 184, 188
Thrasybulus of Miletus, 96
Thrasybulus, Athenian *chorêgos* before 430 BC, 151
Thrasybulus, son of Lycus, 188, 191
Thrasylochus, money-lender, 237
Thucydides, historian, 27, 32, 35, 100, 102, 108, 109, 134, 148, 153, 156, 159, 160, 163, 164, 174, 177, 184
Thucydides, son of Melesias, 144
Thurii, 134
Thymaetadae, 225
timai, 38, 39, 241
Timodemos of Athens, 136
Timomachus, 59
Timonothus, Athenian ambassador to Lesbos, 239
Timotheus, general, 197, 198
Timotheus, son of Conon (ancestor of the general), 128
Timotheus, tragic poet, 151
Tlos, 20
traders, 74, 220
treasure house of the Corinthians at Delphi, 101
treasure houses on the acropolis (Athens), 76
tribes. *See phylai*
tribute, 6, 145, 148, 160
 exemption from, 47
triêrarchiai, triêrarchoi, 37, 80, 82, 153, 174, 175, 187, 200, 202, 203, 204, 206, 207, 213, 215, 217, 219, 220, 224, 244, 248
triremes, 206, 207
 in the time of Hippias, 80
Troy, Trojans, 61
Tyndareus, 61
tyrants, 17, 64, 73, 80, 107, 143, 146, 163, 164, 191, 254
 and construction projects, 76, 92, 93, 99, 101
 and *epinikia*, 71
 and the demos, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96
 as benefactors of the demos, 93, 95, 98
 as victorious athletes, 94
 benefactions by, 91, 93, 96, 99, 103
 compared to other members of the elite, 91, 96, 97, 98
 Sicilian, 94
 social background of, 91, 92, 93
 their capacity to mobilize resources, 99
 their relationship with other members of the elite, 92, 96
 wealth of, 92, 94, 95, 97, 98
Tyrtaeus, 85, 86, 87, 89, 135

Valerius Maximus, 178
Veyne, Paul, 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 10, 11, 16, 77, 231, 254
victor Aristoclidas of Aegina, 126
votive inscriptions, 64, 116, 129, 167, 172

walls, 37, 39, 72, 144, 193, 208, 209, 212, 213, 242, 246, 255
 of Corinth, 101
war between Croton and Sybaris, 61
wealth, 140, 144, 154, 156, 224
 and gifts, 15, 32
 and prestige, 15
 and social hierarchies, 15
 concealment of, 83, 200, 217
 redistribution of, 146, 157, 214
wealthy, 205, *see* rich
Weber, Max, 1, 10, 11, 254
wine as reward, 62

Xanthippus, father of Pericles, 167
Xanthippus, son of Pericles, 145
Xanthus, 37, 41, 42, 45, 47
xenia (hospitality meal), 86, 110, 220, 234, 235, 237, 239, 240
 as gift or reward, 238, 240
 differences between *deipnon* and, 235
 origins of, 236
xenia (ritualized friendship), 16, 44, 52, 112, 236, 240, 251
 and *dôreai*, 44
 and gift-exchange, 113, 251
 similarities between euergetism and, 113
Xenocles, Athenian *chorêgos* in 459/8 BC, 151
Xenocles, gymnasiarch in 346/5 BC, 173
Xenophanes, 66, 67, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 90, 132, 135, 137, 252
Xenophon, 32, 33, 35, 109, 183, 184, 185, 202, 204, 207, 215, 217, 220, 239
Xerxes I, 113